

H. Sect.

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE HOLINESS CODE IN
RELATION TO THE PROPHETIC TEACHING.

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Edinburgh.

By

ALFRED G. FISK

April, 1930

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE HOLINESS CODE IN
RELATION TO THE PROPHETIC TEACHING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Author references in the footnotes refer to the titles in the Bibliography unless otherwise stated).

INTRODUCTION AND CRITICISM

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------|------|
| Chapman and Streane, | Leviticus, in Camb. Bib. | 1914 | |
| A. R. S. Kennedy, | Leviticus, in Cent. Bib. | 1911 | |
| Driver and White, | Leviticus, in Haupt's Series:
Sacred Books of the Old Testament
(Hebrew text and English notes) | 1894 | |
| | also English edition in Polychrome Bible, | 1898 | |
| G. F. Moore, | Leviticus, in Encyclopedia Biblica III, col. 2776-2793 | 1902 | |
| A. Bertholet, | Leviticus, in Marti's Hand-Commentar. | 1901 | |
| A. Dillmann, | Leviticus, in Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. | 1897 | E/ |
| B. Baentsch, | Leviticus, in Nowack's H-C. | 1903 | k/ |
| Adalbert Merx, | Die Bücher Moses und Josua, (esp. chapter VI). | 1907 | 2/ n |
| Driver, lor, | Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament Rev. | 1909 | |
| Sellin, | Introduction to the Old Testament, Eng. trans. | 1923 | |
| J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford, | Composition of the Hexateuch | 1902 | H |
| W. E. Addis, | The Documents of the Hexateuch | 1898 | eu/ |
| E. S. Brightman, | Sources of the Hexateuch (Excellent Bibliography, including the German material) | 1918 | |

Bibliography (continued)

- Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, "The Hexateuch" - 1900
- Kuenen, The Hexateuch - 1886
- C. F. Kent, Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, 1907
- A. T. Chapman, Introduction to Pentateuch (Camb. Bib.) 1911
- D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism 1924
- F. C. Eiselen, The Books of the Pentateuch 1916
- Geo. A. Barton, Leviticus, Jewish Encyclopedia VIII, pp. 508-509
- D. B. Erdmans, Alttestamentliche Studien vol. IV. (Leviticus) 1912 ^{4/}
- Harford-Battersby, Leviticus, Hastings' Dict. of Bible III, pp. 102-109
- L. B. Paton, "The Original Form of Leviticus XVII-XIX" in Journal of Biblical Literature vol. XVI (1897) 31 seq.; XVII, 149 seq.; XVIII, 35 seq.
- L. B. Paton, "The Holiness Code and Ezekiel" in Presbyterian and Reformed Review, vol. VII (1896) pp. 98-115. ^{y/}

FOR STUDY OF PRIMITIVE BACKGROUND, EARLY IDEAS OF SACRIFICE, etc.

- W. R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites, 1894
- E. B. Taylor, Primitive Culture, 1913
- J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough, 1911
- Herbert Spencer, Principles of Sociology, 1885 (vol. 1, p. 277ff).
- F. B. Jevons, Introduction to the History of Religion, 1896
- E. Westermarck, Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas, 1908

Bibliography (continued)

FOR RELIGIOUS IDEAS

- Bandissin, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte.
- W. R. Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 1881
- J. P. Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews 1914
(esp. ch. 19 on Holiness)
- H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas of the O.T. 1913
- C. G. Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures - "Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion" - 1892
- A. C. Welch, Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom 1912
- A. Kuenen, Religion of Israel, (3 vols) 1875
- Karl Budde, Religion of Israel to the Exile 1899
- Hermann Schultz, "The Significance of Sacrifice in the Old Testament" in American Journal of Theology (A.J.T.) vol. IV, pp. 257-313 1900
- W. P. Patterson, "Sacrifice" - art in H.D.B., vol. IV, pp. 329-349
- G. F. Moore, "Sacrifice" - art. in Encyclopaedia Biblica (En.Bi.) IV. col. 4183-4233
- E. O. James, "Sacrifice", Introductory and Primitive" in E.R.E. vol. II, p. 31 seq.
- R.A.S. Macalister, "Sacrifice, Semitic" in E.R.E. vol. t/ i
p. 31 seq.
- J. Skinner, "Holiness" in H.D.B. vol. II, p. 394-401
- G. A. Simcox, "Clean and Unclean, Holy and Profane," in En.Bi. I, col. 836-848
- J. O. F. Murray, "Atonement" in H.D.B. I, p. 197 ff
- A. S. Peake, "Unclean" in H.D.B. IV, p. 825-834
- J. Skinner "Righteousness in O.T." in H.D.B. IV, p. 272-281
- S. R. Driver, "Propitiation" in H.D.B. IV, pp. 128-132
- A. R. S. Kennedy, "Food," and "Meals" in H.D.B. vol. II and III

Bibliography (continued)

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------|
| W. R. Smith, | "Sacrifice" art. in Encyclopedia Britannica
9th ed. Vol.XXI, p. 132-8 | |
| R. Kittel, | "Holiness of God" art. in New Schaff-Herzog
Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge
(abb.S.H.R.E.) vol. V, p. 316-7 | |
| Herman Schultz, | Old Testament Theology, (2 vols.) | 1892 |
| G. F. Oehler, | Theology of the Old Testament(3 vols.) | 1874 |
| Arch. Duff, | Old Testament Theology, | 1891 |
| A. B. Davidson, | Theology of O. T. | 1904 |
| Ch. Piepenbring, | Theology of the Old Testament | 1893 |
| Karl Marti, | Religion of the O. T. | 1907 |
| W. R. Harper, | The Priestly Element in O.T.
(contains exhaustive bibliography) | 1905 |
| Arch. Duff, | Theol. and Ethics of the Hebrews,
II | 1901 |
| A. F. Kirkpatrick, | The Doctrine of the Prophets, | 1890 k/ |
| B. Duhm, | Die Theologie der Propheten, | 1875 |
| J. M. P. Smith, | The Prophets and their Times | |
| A. G. Knudson, | Beacon Lights of Prophecy | 1914 |
| - | Religious Teaching of O. T. | 1918 |
| Rudolf Kittel | Great Men and Movements in Israel
(Eng. trans.) | 1929 |
| H. R. Smith, | The Prophets of Israel | 1882 |
| W. R. Harper, | Amos and Hosea in I.C.C. | 1905 |
| G. A. Smith, | The Book of the Twelve Prophets
(Rev. ed.) | 1928 |
| H. G. Mitchell | Amos: an Essay in Exegesis, | 1900 |
| Melville Scott, | The Message of Hosea, | 1921 |
| G. A. Smith, | The Book of Isaiah | 1927 |

Bibliography (continued)

Commentaries on Isaiah: G.B.Gray (I.C.C.1912)
J. Skinner (CambBib. 1915)
O. C. Whitehouse (Cent.Bib.1905)
Ed. König 1926
B. Duhm 1902
Dillmann 1898

Skinner, Prophecy and Religion 1922

G. A. Smith, Jeremiah 1923

A. C. Welch, Jeremiah 1928

Commentaries on Jeremiah: By Peake (Cent. Bib.)
Streane (Camb. Bib.)
L. E. Binns (West. Com.)
Duhm
Cornill *Vol. 3, 2nd ed.* ^

A. B. Davidson, "Jeremiah" article in H.D.B.

N. S. Schmidt, "Jeremiah" article in Enc. Bibl

Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel

More popular works on Jeremiah by Cheyne, J. R. Gillies,
A. Ramsay, G. F. Findlay, Lofthouse,
R. Calkins.

A. W. Streane, The Double Text of Jeremiah.

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE HOLINESS CODE IN

RELATION TO THE PROPHETIC TEACHING.

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION - - - -	1-14
Purpose and Scope - - - -	1
Critical Analysis of H - - - -	3
THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF H - - - -	15-52
Ideas of Holiness and Conception of God, etc. -	15
Sin and Atonement - - - -	38
Sacrifice - - - -	48
AMOS - - - -	53-70
Literary Relationship to H - - - -	53
Conception of God - - - -	54
Holiness - - - -	56
Sin and Repentance - - - -	58
Attitude Toward Cult - - - -	59
Worship - - - -	65
Summary contrast to H - - - -	69
HOSEA - - - -	71-92
Literary parallelism to H - - - -	71
Relationship between Yahweh and Israel -	75
Holiness - - - -	80
Yahweh's Demands - - - -	81
Regarding the Priesthood - - - -	84
Sin and Expiation - - - -	86
The Cult - - - -	89
ISAIAH - - - -	93-120
Holiness - - - -	93
Contrast to H - - - -	109
The Cult - - - -	112
Faith - - - -	118
JEREMIAH - - - -	121-156
Israel's Faithlessness and Resultant Sins -	121
Heathen Worship - - - -	123
Cultic ceremonies - - - -	124
Reliance on Foreign Powers - - - -	128
Unrighteousness - - - -	130
Deep Sense of Sin and Repentance - - - -	132
Content of Religion spiritualized - - - -	137
Religion Individualized - - - -	143
Message for the Nation as well - - - -	147
Universalism - - - -	148
Summary Contrast to H - - - -	151

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
CONCLUSION - - - - -	157-168
Cult and Morality on a par in H - -	157
Resultant Conceptions of Sin and Repentance Confused	158
Regard for Cult tended to Obscure Moral Demands	160
Prophetic Attitude toward Sacrificial System-	161
Conception of God and Holiness - -	165

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE HOLINESS CODE IN
RELATION TO THE PROPHETIC TEACHING.

--- o ---

The purpose of the present paper is to study the view of religion in the Holiness Code (Lev.17-26), and to compare it with that of the pre-exilic prophets. Our primary interest will not be critical or textual, but the relationship of ideas. The Code and the prophets represent two views of religion. Though they have much in common they are in regard to certain basic concepts fundamentally opposed. In Ancient Israel these ideas grew up side by side indistinguishable in the mind of man. As primitive people may overlay one religion upon another thinking to accept each, so early Yahwism felt no incompatibility between these two views of religion. But in the period of the pre-exilic prophets one came to be set over against the other; they came into open conflict. It is the aim of the present study to trace the roots of this conflict in the underlying ideas, and to consider the implications of such ideas in influencing the course of religion.

No critical analysis of the Holiness Code is therefore within our present scope. This has already been made the subject of considerable investigation, and

although entire agreement has not been reached regarding the questions of date, authorship, etc., the present study proposes ~~not~~ to renew such investigation but to use its results. A study of ideas, however, cannot avoid critical problems. If ideas are similar, one asks, Are they independent? Do they spring from a common literary source? Is one derived from the other? If so, which was first? If the ideas seem opposed, Were they aware of each other's existence? Was one consciously attacking or correcting the other? Which was first? etc. For this reason, although no attempt is here made in the way of original investigation into critical questions, it will be necessary at the outset to summarize the results of others and to state the general assumptions upon which the present study moves.

By common consent among critics¹⁾ chapters 17-26 of Leviticus are set off by themselves as a separate unit, probably at one time an independent law code. Since the days of Klostermann this code has been appropriately designated by the title, Law of Holiness, or the symbol H, from the fact that its fundamental commandment is for Israel to be holy because Yahweh its God is holy (19² 20⁷ etc.).

1) Exceptions such as Eerdmans will be mentioned later.

Critics are agreed that the code as we now have it is the product of various revisions and redactions and that it was finally included by the priestly editors in their edition of Israel's history and law. In the course of their editing these priestly scribes (R^P) made slight changes and additions in order to harmonize it better with their own views. On the whole, these additions are easily distinguished (see any commentary). It is likely also that R^P cut out some sections of H and bridged the gap by his own interpolations. This may account for other fragments of Holiness-legislation embodied elsewhere in the pentateuch bearing the marks of H and apparently at one time a part of his code. A discussion of this problem can be found in Driver (L.O.T.), Moore (En.Bi.col 2787) and the commentators. Without entering upon the arguments involved, we can accept the consensus of opinion that Lev. 11⁴³⁻⁴⁵ and Num. 15³⁷⁻⁴¹ are genuine H material; leaving out of our consideration more doubtful passages. S/

It is often difficult to determine precisely to what age and what redactor certain additions in H are due. The age of the Code as a collection has been differently estimated according to the stress laid on its constituent elements. A distinction immediately arises between the legislative material of which the Code is composed and the hortatory framework in which it is set. The former

is obviously not all of one date. The repetitions and duplications indicate diversity of source which in turn involves variety of age. Certain sections give evidence of repeated elaborations by later scribes. Critics are substantially agreed, however, that unity was given to the whole by a compiler R^h who fit¹⁾ the varied legislative ^{red/} material into its present parenetic framework. To determine the date of the unified collection, therefore, our primary concern is not with the legislative material but with the hortatory framework which binds it together. To the hand of this redactor R^h are generally assigned the short exhortations which in many cases precede or follow the legislative sections, as well as the notable discourse (26³⁻⁴⁵), with which the entire collection closes.

The resemblance not only between the legislation, but also between this hortatory material and the work of the prophet Ezekiel was early pointed out, and much has been said concerning its implications for the date of H.²⁾ The movement of critical thought concerning this question need not here be traced. After a long period of discussion

-
- 1) There seems little approval of the hypothesis of Baentsch that the Code is not a unit but is divided into sections coming from different hands. See on this Baentsch, and criticism by Moore, et al (Ref. in my bibliography).
- 2) See exhaustive parallels and discussion: Driver, L. O.T. pp. 147-150; Chapman, Intro. to Penta., app.v; Chapman and Streane, App. III; Carpenter and Harford, Hex. p.277-284; Paton, Presby and Ref. Rev. vol.vii (1896) pp.98-115, etc.

in which weighty authorities have held opposing views, there is now substantial agreement among more recent critics not only against the view of Graf, Kayser, and Horst that Ezekiel was the author or compiler of H,¹⁾ but also in support of the view that H preceded Ezekiel and is the earlier and more original of the two.²⁾ Driver and Moore³⁾ point out that Lev. 26 is terse and forcible in its style, while Ezekiel is diffuse, and that Lev. appears to have the advantage in originality of expression and in connection of thought, which originality a cento of reminiscences picked up from all parts of Ezekiel could hardly produce. Since the parallels to Ezekiel include legislative material in which H is clearly recognized to have the priority, the most natural hypothesis is that Ezekiel derived both from the same source. This conclusion is borne out by other arguments indicating that Ezekiel is later than H: e.g. his distinction between priests and Levites, fixed dates for feasts, minuter classification of sacrifices, etc.³⁾ In adopting this conclusion it is necessary to hold that H has undergone later redaction by the author of P from whom additions on the basis of Ezekiel and his own theories were made. In Ezekiel's day H had not yet been combined with P and Driver points out that his

1) J. Herrmann (Ezekiel: Übersetzt und erklärt, 1924), however, reverts to this view.

2) So Sellin, Driver, Moore, Kent, Eisselen, etc.

3) See further: Driver, Paton, Moore, Baentsch, Kuenen, etc.

familiarity with the former, which, though now incorporated with P, represents an earlier stage of legislation, would be thus naturally explained.

If in the light of present criticism we assume that H preceded Ezekiel, our next question is to determine how much earlier it can be placed. Does it come from the early years of exile before Ezekiel? - or, as some have suggested, from the Jews in Babylon between the first and second captivity? Or can it be confidently asserted to be pre-exilic? This is a more difficult question than that of the Code's relation to Ezekiel. Unfortunately the parenetic framework upon which such argument rests has not escaped revision by later hands, and it is not easy to determine without recourse to a priori theories just the extent of later additions. This is true, for instance, regarding the last part of chap. 26 which is generally recognized to presuppose the exile. Critics such as Wellhausen (Hist. p. 383f), Kuenen (Hex. sec. 15.9), Baentsch (p. 126f), Smend (p. xxvif) and Addis (p. 180) who take this view and who accept this chapter as substantially the work of R^h, must, therefore, place his redaction of the Code during or after the exile. Dillman (Ex-Lev. p. 677) and Moore (E.E. col. 2787 & 2791) on the other hand, ascribe the definitely exilic verses on other grounds to later hands; and they can therefore place R^h before the exile.

A third view is put forward by Driver (L.C.T.p.150f) who though accepting 26 as genuinely from the hand of R^h , yet maintains that the certainty of approaching exile (which was unquestionably realized by the prophets of Jeremiah's age) would, not less than the actual exile, form a sufficient basis for the supposedly exilic verses at the end of the chapter; while on the other hand hardly any promise made when once the exile had become an actual fact, and least of all a promise so indefinite in its terms as 26⁴⁰⁻⁴⁵, could neutralize the deterrent effect of such a denunciation of disaster and exile as that contained in vv 14-39.

If the view be accepted that H is pre-exilic, the questions immediately arise: How much earlier? What was its relation to the Josianic reform? In a discussion of this problem it becomes increasingly difficult to keep the consideration of the passages from R^h separate from a consideration of the laws embodied in the Code. All critics admit that the roots of these laws, if not also their present form, go far back in the history of Israel. While it cannot be argued from this that the codification of H was as ancient, it would seem evident that if in H as a code certain laws presupposing local sanctuaries were embodied without revision, the redactor must have lived before the centralization of the cult. It is extremely difficult, however, to determine

whether all the additions which are clearly post-Josianic are due to a later hand than R^h. An outstanding illustration of this difficulty is to be found in the important regulation Lev. 17¹⁻⁷. As we now have it, this law presupposes the centralization of the cult; but by omitting what are patently later additions, and without making any change in what remains, the early law stands thus: "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, and hath not brought it before Yahweh: blood shall be imputed to that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people."

In this form the law cannot have come from a time after the Josianic reform, for "before Yahweh" presupposes the existence of the high places.¹⁾ As we now have it, the law shows the hand of at least two modifications. One addition was the insertion of the word $\int \text{מִשְׁכָּן}$ before Yahweh rendering it "before the abode (tabernacle, of Yahweh."

A later editor has brought in the "tent of meeting". What was the precise form of this law as it came from the pen of R^h? If the word "mishkan" comes from his hand, it might still apply to the local sanctuary without implying centralization.²⁾ If in this form it does imply centralization, it would appear to represent the extreme consequence

1) The view that it could apply to the one sanctuary to which all in the post-exilic community had access is now discarded by critics.

2) So Paton. See discussion in Driver's L.O.T. p.51 and S.B.O.T. p.86.

of the Josianic reform leaving no place for the slaughter of animals for food without sacrificial rites, for which Deut. makes express provision (12^{15f,20-5}). It is possible, however, that the word mishkan was introduced by a priestly editor later than R^h (not the same as the editor who brought in the "tent of meeting").¹⁾ As 17⁴ is the only passage in H which appears to restrict sacrifice to a single sanctuary (if we eliminated additions accepted as coming from R^p), it may reasonably be urged that "if R^h adopted the principle of centralization so uncompromisingly in this verse, he would hardly have failed to show elsewhere some symptom of zeal for the reform or hostility to the local cults - contrast Deut, Jeremiah, Ezekiel."²⁾ Since 17⁴ can hardly be used to set the date of H, and since there are no other conclusive verses regarding centralization, it is an open question as to whether the holiness-redactor (R^h) completed his work before or after the Josianic reform.

That H is younger than Deut. because some of its laws indicate a more advanced development is a question we cannot enter upon.³⁾ Even if such a conclusion could be proved (which is very doubtful-See Moore, etc.) the date of the legislation in Deuteronomy is by no means certain⁴⁾ and cannot serve as a fixed point.

1) Cf Moore En. Bib. col 2790

2) ~~Attestamentliche Studien~~ IV (esp. pp. 83-135) Ibid.

3) See Chapman: pp.228-31, 244f.

4) Cf. Recent investigations by Welch, Oestreicher.

1,

The recent investigation of Eerdmans¹ concerning the antiquity of Leviticus deserves notice. According to his view chaps. 17-26 with a large amount of material elsewhere in Leviticus (esp. in chaps. 1-7, 11-16), comes from a much earlier date than is commonly thought. While disentangling much of this material as very ancient he maintains that it was worked up into a code and became the reform book of Hezekiah - a similar theory to the commonly accepted view that Deut. is the reform book of Josiah. Many questions raised by this study of Eerdmans are outside the scope of this paper. But it is significant that a critic of the merit of Sellin, who has studied the question in the light of this recent investigation, is inclined to favor a pre-Josianic date for the redaction of the Holiness Code.²

What, then, can be our conclusion regarding the date of R^h's compilation? Without dogmatizing, the time of Ezekiel may be set as a terminus ad quem; and in the light of critical investigation, there is at least the possibility if not the probability of its bearing a pre-exilic date. (Thus: Driver, Moore, Sellin, Kennedy, Eerdmans, Riehm, Klostermann, Barton,³ Though some of these critics favor even a pre-Josianic date, it would be somewhat precarious

1) Alttestamentliche Studien IV (esp. pp. 83-135)

2) *Op. cit.* p. 47-8

3) See references above and in bibliography. For the last named: Jewish Ency. VIII. p. 54.

to place its redaction with the present parenetic framework (minus later additions), much before the closing years of the kingdom. (Cf. Driver's conclusion: "It seems that they were arranged in their present parenetic framework by an author who was at once a priest and a prophet, probably towards the closing years of the monarchy." L.O.T.p.151). But the question of the date of H's editing may be left aside as undetermined, for our present study does not depend upon it. The broad conceptions and underlying ideas with which we will deal are not to be found mainly in Chap.26 or the hom~~al~~^litic sections. i/ e/

We find more unanimity among critics concerning the antiquity of the legislative material itself. As Moore says: "The analysis of Lev. 17-26 shows that the laws in H were not conceived and expressed by the author of the book, but were taken by him from preceding collections in a form already fixed. Even where the share of R^h is largest, as in the provisions for the jubilee year (25^{8ff}) there is a basis of older law."¹⁾ In taking this view it is understood that the occasional references to the tabernacle and the camp, to Aaron and his sons, and similar phrases of affinity with P, are interpolations by a later hand (R^p).

1) Op.cit.

That the legislative material in H is a compilation from various sources of an earlier age is generally accepted. One critic has called it a "compilation of compilations."¹⁾ Its composite origin is betrayed by the frequent repetitions and overlappings (e.g. Chaps 18 and 20; 19⁹ and 23²²; 17¹⁰⁻¹⁴ and 19²⁶ etc. ~~etc.~~ see Addis p.180, C-H p. 144f., Baentsch, etc.) Only a hypothesis of this kind can account for the existence of chap.18 and 20 side by side. The former chapter forbids different kinds of sexual vice, while the latter imposes penalty for similar sins. The lists, moreover, are not identical and their order is altogether different. As Addis says: "It is inconceivable that an original legislator should have separated offense and punishment in this manner."²⁾ It may be presumed, therefore, that H took his legislative material from various collections, doubtless coming from different times and places or different priestly families or guilds. It is conjectured, for instance, that one source used by H was a legislative code belonging originally to J (C-H p.146).

On this hypothesis it is impossible to set a single date for all the legislative material. Without attempting to analyze it piece by piece, its general antiquity is indicated by the fact that H makes no distinction between secular and sacrificial slaughter; he seems to know

1) Lofthouse in Peake's one Vol. Com.

2) Op.cit. p.180.

nothing of a central sanctuary or of a sacerdotal hierarchy; the priest is simply "the priest" and Levites are not mentioned. ("The priest who is greater than his brethren" upon whom greater restrictions are laid (21¹⁰) does not imply a time later than the early prophets; for every sanctuary had a head priest cf. Shiloh, Nob, Bethel, Jerusalem. cf also "the priest" and "the chief priest" II Kings 11^{9ff}, 16^{10f}, 22^{10ff}, 25¹⁸, Amos 7^{10ff}). Further, sacrifice is still in its more primitive and undeveloped state; the sin and guilt offerings are unknown and all sacrifices are comprehended under the general division of burnt-offerings and sacrifices in which the offerer partook (*ןִיָּבֵן* and *ןִיָּבֵן*). In the regulations concerning the consumption of the "holy things" (22), no distinction is drawn corresponding to that of Num. 18⁸ between the "most holy things" which may be eaten by priests alone, and the "holy things" of which all clean members of the priestly families including females may partake. H's system of feast_s is also simple, corresponding closely to ^{as/} those in Deut and the early prophetic narratives. For these feasts no fixed date has yet been established and they have a close connection with the agricultural life of the people. The spring feast is still simply a harvest festival and the later stern day of atonement is unknown. The antiquity of this legislative material is further

shown in traces of its early arrangement in series or groups of fives and tens, each decad or pentad winding up with the customary formula, "I am Yahweh".¹⁾ These considerations indicate that the legislative material is very early, at least as early as the pre-exilic prophets. Much of it must be even earlier, with its roots going down, as Kent says, "to the Mosaic and nomadic periods of Israelitish history."²⁾ Even critics like Baentsch (op.cit) and Steuernagel (Einl. A.T.) who date the compilation of the Code as a whole during the exile, lay particular stress on the large amount of pre-exilic material present in the legislative sections, and Driver (L.C.T. 151) who places the redactor toward the close of the monarchy says that "the laws of H date in the main from a considerably earlier time," - a conclusion with which critics are in general agreement.

Even allowing room for considerable difference of opinion regarding the exact amount of this legislation which is early, enough indisputably early material remains to determine the general attitude which governed the legislators and the underlying concepts of their religion. The question which concerns us is not to determine whether this specific law is early and that late; for it can be concluded that this group of laws, which on the whole evinces a common conception of God and His requirements, is more or less contemporaneous with the prophets.

1) See Paton

2) Israel's Laws, p.41

It has long been recognized that the most distinctive idea in Lev. 17-26 is that of holiness. (This led to Klostermann's name, "The Law of Holiness"). Our inquiry into the fundamental ideas of the code should begin, therefore, with its conception of holiness.

The original meaning of the word kadosh (Heb קדוש adj. "holy and קדוּשָׁה noun "holiness" and their derivatives) is by no means indisputably clear.¹⁾ The older view of Gesenius that the root meant "clear" or brilliant" is still defended by some scholars, notably Dillmann who refers to the Assyrian kuddusu (said to be a synonym for "bright") and the Arabic kada "clear", and is disposed to connect the root with (קדש) (new).²⁾ Delitzsch, on the other hand (PRE² art. "Heiligkeit Gottes"), reasoning from the Sumerian equivalent of kadistu (sacred prostitute), found a confirmation of the old theological definition of holiness as freedom from defect. Concerning these views, Skinner says (HDB II 395) "These are highly speculative constructions, which command no confidence and give no assurance that they reach the original sense of the word." The majority of critics now follow Baudissin (see ref. in Bibliography), who traced the fundamental idea to that of "separation". According to this view, holiness is related to the more primitive idea of tabu, and denotes the "separated",

1) See Dictionary articles noted in Bibliography, and Q.T. Theologies: Duff p.161-5, Oehler I p.154ff, Schultz II p.167ff. Dillman p.254, etc. also Baudissin.
 2) Against this view see R.R. Smith "Prophets", p.424.

the "untouchable", the "unapproachable". Yet it is unlikely that an original meaning could have been so entirely negative. On the whole, the discussion concerning the original meaning of kadosh has led to considerable speculation but to little certainty and we can conclude with Skinner: "The original idea conveyed by the words is altogether uncertain, neither etymology nor the analogy of the cognate dialects having as yet thrown much light on the subject."

It is always precarious to lay too much stress on the root-meaning of a word which at best may be uncertain or obscure. It does not necessarily follow that the meaning of kadosh in the dim background of Semetic tradition, had any great influence upon its use in this Code. The meaning of such a term may vary from one period to another. It is the habit of religious people to continue the use of an old word long after its original sense has been changed and new content put into it. This may have been done in old Israel, especially with a word such as this which goes back to very ancient and widespread usage. We are on much firmer ground when we turn from etymological considerations and seek to derive its meaning in the Code from its usage therein; observing the various objects called holy, and the various connections of thought in which it occurs. Only on the basis of such an examination can we discuss its abstract meaning.

In examining the Code we are struck at once by the fact that the word holy had a very wide application. There are holy objects including sacrifices (22^{passim} $19^8 23^{20}$, and the sanctuary itself ($19^{30} 21^{12,23} 26^2$); holy places (24^9); holy persons including the priests ($21^{6-7,8,15,23} 22^9,16$) and the people of Israel as a whole ($19^2 20^7,24,26 22^{32} 21^8$ etc.); holy days and festivals (ch. 23-25 *passim*. See commentaries for genuine H material here); and finally the name of Yahweh ($20^3 22^2,32$) and Yahweh Himself ($19^2 20^7,26 21^8 22^{32} 11^{44,45}$) is called holy.

Beginning with the key verse, "Ye shall be holy, for I, Yahweh, your God am Holy" ($19^2 20^7$ cf. $20^{26a} 11^{44,45}$), we note that holiness - whatever it may be - is laid down as a characteristic of Israel's God. "I Yahweh am holy" is fundamental. It is made the basis of all else. Because Yahweh is holy, He expects those who belong to Him to be holy too.

Holiness as a predicate of Godhead was not, however, peculiar to Israel's God. "The holy gods" is a standing designation of the Phoenician deities as is shown in the monument of Eshmunazar.¹⁾ Skinner maintains²⁾ that holiness does not express any special attribute of the divine nature but rather the general notion of godhead as distinguished from all else. Holy becomes somewhat synonymous with divine.

1) See Cooke: North Semitic Inscriptions, p.31
2) Isaiah p. xlixf.

To put definite content into the term we must know the conception of the deity to whom or in relation to whom, it was predicated. The term did not necessarily connote ethical purity, for the deities to whom it was applied by the heathen Semites were not only immoral from our point of view but were not even regarded as moral by their own worshippers.¹⁾

"Be ye holy" might therefore mean anything. ("The fact that the ~~Hierodoloi~~ Hierodoloi, or sacred prostitutes, of the Canaanite religion were known as "holy women" indicates this. Where the deity was not moral, holiness could not be a moral concept.) But "Be ye holy as I am holy" carries a definite connotation depending upon the conception of God. As used by the Hebrews this great precept might be paraphrased, "Be ye Yahwistic, for I am Yahweh your God." Holiness is not a thing of life or conduct which can be separated from religion. It is vitally connected with God and is the outcome of His character and demands. Cf. 22³² "I am Yahweh who halloweth you (who makes you holy)." In 20²⁶ the words holy "unto me" are added. Yahweh is not only the basis and source of Israel's holiness; He is its object and end. They are to be holy unto Him (cf. Num. 15^{4b} "Be holy unto your God"). 20²⁶ continues, "Ye shall be holy unto me, for I Yahweh am holy, and have set you apart from the peoples that ye should be mine." The last clause seems parallel to the first: "Ye shall be holy....."

^{Skinner:}
1) [^]Isaiah p.L.

ye shall be mine." To belong to Yahweh is to be holy; to be holy is to belong to Yahweh. God's primary requirement that Israel be holy is that they be peculiarly His ("mine"). The remainder of the verse bears out this interpretation: in order that ye may be holy, in order that ye may be mine, "I have set you apart from the people", i.e. you are to have a closeness of relation to me that others will not have; you are to be "holy unto me." The relation to Yahweh is the fundamental aspect of holiness. It is this relationship which implies a separation from other things (here, other peoples). The relation to Yahweh is primary; the secondary element of separation depends upon it, and is only for the purpose of making that relationship more close and exclusive.

After this fundamental demand of the Code for the holiness of all Israel there are further demands for the special holiness of priests (esp. ch. 21 and 22). "They shall be holy unto their God; for the offering of Yahweh, the bread of their God they do offer; therefore they shall be holy" (21⁶). Very significantly the stress is here laid on precisely the same elements we have noted above. The priests shall be holy unto their God (cf. v.7C). Holiness is holiness unto Yahweh. The reason that the priests are to be especially holy is because of their special relation to Him; "the bread of their God they offer; therefore they

shall be holy." Yahweh's holiness is again the basis of the demand: "they shall be holy for I Yahweh am holy" (8C Greek version), and holiness is a quality derived from Him; "I, Yahweh, sanctify ("make holy" or "hallow") them," a fact five times repeated (21^{8,15,23}22^{9,16}). It is Yahweh who makes them holy. Note also the element of separation. As the holiness of Israel meant a special relation to Yahweh which implied separation from other peoples, so the greater holiness of priests means more close relationship to Him and a greater separation from other things and people (21 and 22 passim).

The same aspects of holiness are also to be found where it is predicated to things. The sanctuary altar, and other sacred objects or places (21²³Dillm., Driver-Wh.) are sanctified or made holy by Yahweh. The "holy things" or sacrifices are "holy to Yahweh" for the priests (23²⁰22²19⁸) And being devoted to Yahweh they are to be separated from common use (22^{passim}).

The primary seat of holiness lies in Yahweh Himself. Other things derive their holiness from Him or from connection with Him. Because of this special relation to God, men could not do with holy people and things what they pleased. Being holy, they were therefore to be separated or tabu. Notwithstanding what students^{of} comparative religion may say as to the priority of the conception of holiness and

tabu to the conception of God among primitive peoples in general, we must recognize that in this Code at least the conception of God and of His holiness underlies and is fundamental to all else. People, priests and things are sanctified or made holy by Him; they are to be holy unto Him. Acts of desecration or unholiness are said to profane the holy name of Yahweh (18²¹20³19¹²,30²²2³²26²). Yahweh's holiness is taken for granted as adequate reason or justification for all other demands of holiness. The clause, "for I, Yahweh, am holy," runs like a refrain throughout the code, the basis of everything. Clearly, the holiness of Yahweh is cardinal and fundamental, and to understand what holiness meant in general, we must understand first what was meant by the holiness of God. Just what was in the mind of ^{the} lawgiver when he wrote, "I, Yahweh, am holy"?

He gives us no definite answer. The holiness of Yahweh is always taken for granted; it is never explained. We can only learn its meaning from a study of what it involves in the Code. Because Yahweh is holy He makes certain demands; because He is holy he prohibits certain things. From a study of these - on the one hand positive, on the other negative - we can reason back to the character of holiness upon which they are based.

In the first place the holiness of Yahweh demands the exclusive patronage of His people. He reacts strongly against the worship of idols or foreign gods and forbids His people to partake in the heathen religious practices of foreign nations. "Do not regard unreal gods; nor make for yourselves molten gods: I am Yahweh your God" (19⁴). Yahweh in His holiness will not tolerate the worship of false gods. "You shall not make for yourselves any idols; nor erect for yourselves a carved image or pillar to bow down to it: for I am Yahweh your God" (26¹). The holy God Yahweh, considers Himself unique. He demands the exclusive devotion of his people. "I, Yahweh, am your God," is almost fifty times ~~this phrase is~~ repeated in the code; i.e. I am the only God you shall worship. This sense of exclusiveness is a definite aspect of Yahweh's holiness. In 18²¹ and 20¹⁻⁷ where we find His strict prohibition of Molech worship, it is definitely stated that such worship profanes the holiness of Yahweh, and because He is holy cannot be tolerated: "Thou shalt not give of thy seed to make them pass through the fire to Molech: thou shalt not profane the name of thy God; I am Yahweh" (18²¹). The holiness of Yahweh cannot tolerate such profanation, it defiles His sanctuary and holy name (20³): therefore offenders must be killed and Yahweh Himself sets His face against them, cutting them off from among His people (20^{2,5}). The

underlying motive for this command is that Yahweh cannot admit his people in any way to worship another God, - in this case Molech. But a further element is to be noted; already His uniqueness has a moral aspect. Yahweh who demands Israel's exclusive patronage eschews the immoral demand of child sacrifice. He does not say, "Offer your children only to me, not to Molech;" but He rejects the practice entirely, and more severely (20^{2,5}) than in the other instances where only the worship of false gods was involved (26¹19⁴). Yahweh being a holy god reacts against child-sacrifice; Molech does not. Child slaughter defiles Yahweh's sanctuary and profanes His holy name. Some ethical content - at least we can say this much - is indicated in the holiness of Yahweh's character in contrast to that of other gods.

The same aspects of the divine holiness are indicated in the precepts concerning necromancy which follow in 20^{6f,27} cf 19^{26,31}. "Any person who consults a medium or a wizard, deserting me for them, I will set my face against that person and will cut him off from among his people. Sanctify yourselves and be holy for I am Yahweh your God." The primary element stressed is Yahweh's exclusive demand for Israel's devotion. Such consultation of a wizard, etc., involves "deserting me," that is, it involves something like worshipping another god. Hence

we find the same warning or claim: "I yahweh am your God" Y/
 i.e. your only God. To seek after necromancers of any
 kind is to deny the fundamental postulate of the code,
 that Yahweh alone is Israel's exclusive God. Separateness
 from certain things is implied in holiness. The converse
 of giving exclusive devotion to Yahweh is separation from
 all that is non-Yahwistic. For desertion from Yahweh and
 adherence to something non-Yahwistic, the Code uses the
 term defilement. "Be not defiled by them....sanctify your-
 selves and be holy" (19³¹ and 20⁷). Though the primary
 element in this rejection of necromancy is to insure the
 exclusiveness of Yahweh and the people's holiness i.e.
 separateness to Him, the moral element is not lacking in
 this command. Necromancy and divination seem to be repu-
 diated not only because they involve the recognition of
 powers other than His, but because they are inherently wrong.
 Other religions accepted such practices as the recognized
 way of discovering the will of their God.¹⁾ Yahweh of
 Israel says that this practice defiles. He does not lay
 down rules whereby divination can be made specifically
 Yahwistic in contrast to the methods or ritual of Canaanitish
 necromancy. He repudiates it altogether. That this moral
 element was largely unconscious does not minimize its im-
 portance; indeed, quite the reverse. In the mind of this
 lawgiver, necromancy was doubtless not so much immoral

1) Cf Welch: Code of Deut. p.108ff.

as irreligious; still he did see that it was incompatible with the exclusive worship of the Holy God Yahweh, while men of heathen religions around him (and even the primitive Israelites: cf. e.g. I Sam. 14^{41f}23²⁻⁴30⁷⁻⁸) felt in it no such incompatibility.

In chapters 18 and 20 other heathenish practices are condemned. Yahweh sets Himself as distinct from the religions of Egypt and Canaan and demands that His people be holy to Him and separate from all such practices. "I am Yahweh your God. Like the doings of the land of Egypt you shall not do; and like the doings of the land of Canaan you shall not do.....My ordinances shall you perform and my statutes shall ye keep. I am Yahweh your God"(18^{2b-4}). Then follows a long list of impure and immoral practices, ending, "Do not defile yourselves herein; for with all these things the nations are defiled which I am casting out before you and the land is defiled, therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it." Similarly in chap. 20: "You shall not follow the customs of the nations which I am casting out before you; for they did all these things (of immoral and impure character, mentioned earlier in the chapter), therefore I abhorred them. You shall be holy to me, for I, Yahweh, am holy" (20³⁻⁶). We need not list these crimes - adultery, sodomy, incest, bestiality, etc. in detail. They all have to do with moral not ritual sins.

Yahweh in His holiness denounces them and demands that His people keep themselves holy,- separate from such abominations. Why? Certainly there is here something more than the demand to keep themselves from the recognition of other gods. The Code seems to indicate something inherently incompatible between such practices and the character of Israel's God. These crimes are termed "abominations"; they "defile" both those who indulge in them (e.g. 18²⁰) and the nation as a whole (18²⁴) and even the land (18²⁴). The holy God reacts against them in the strongest possible terms. "Anyone who does any of these abominations shall be cut off from among his people" (18²⁹). Because of these things "therefore" I visit the iniquity upon them (18²⁵). Because the nations did these things "therefore I abhorred them" (20²³). It is the immorality of these practices that warrants Yahweh's anger. They are condemned as vile, not merely as involving the recognition of other gods. "I am Yahweh your God and have separated you from the peoples" (20²⁴), coming at the end of this list of vices implies a moral separation as included in the religious. Indeed, these moral demands rest on the religious, on the moral character of Yahweh. This is a new note of emphasis. Yahweh is holy. He is holy as separate from or different from the other gods. So the people who are to be peculiarly His must be different (or

separate, in their moral conduct as well as their worship.

The large amount of ethical legislation and its truly elevated character is a remarkable feature of this Code. That this moral element is one aspect of holiness is made plain by the fact that moral sins are said to "profane the holy name of Yahweh." Thus 19¹² "You shall not swear by my name falsely, so as to profane the name of thy God. I am Yahweh." Probably the preceding verse is also a part of this unit (From one "I am Yahweh" to the next seems the unit basis). This includes the prohibition of stealing, unjust dealing, lying, and swearing falsely as profaning the holiness of Yahweh. This side of the Code's teaching is on a level with that of the prophets. "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor"(19¹⁵) would serve as text for many of the prophetic discourses. "Unrighteousness in judgment" is further denounced in 19³⁵ and just weights and measures enjoined. Besides the condemnation of immorality in ch. 18 and 20 it is denounced again in 19^{20,29,21}⁹. Robbery or withholding wages is condemned 19¹³. Practically every basic principle of morality is included. But the Code goes far beyond mere justice and honesty; it enjoins a love and kind regard for others that could hardly be surpassed: Parents are to be honored(19³),

the aged, deaf, or blind especially respected (19^{32,14}) gleanings of the harvest are to be left for the poor (23²² 19⁹⁻¹⁰), one must not rule over a brother with rigor (25^{43,53}), and a poor relation must be supported (25^{25,35ff}), usury or giving food at interest is forbidden (25³⁷), and finest of all: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart;.... thou shalt not take vengeance nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself....If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall do him no wrong....thou shalt love him as thyself" (19^{17f}, 33f).

It is to be noted that these moral precepts are all based on the character and demand of Yahweh. The refrain, "I am Yahweh" or "Profane not the name of thy God: I am Yahweh" comes at the end of these various ordinances, while standing at the head of ch.19 is the general "Ye shall be holy, for I Yahweh am holy." One aspect of being holy, or Yahwistic, is being moral and merciful.

The Code's effort to stress the exclusiveness of Yahweh and to insure that His people be separated unto Him accounts for much of its ceremonial aspect. The legislators felt that their God, Yahweh, was different from all others and that His people must not confuse Him with other gods. In order to make clear this distinction there must be a

peculiar Yahweh ritual, a distinctive Yahweh priesthood, methods of sacrifice, etc. All this was included in: Be ye Mahwistic, for I am Yahweh your God. Thus Num. 15³⁷⁻⁴¹ commands the wearing of a distinctive dress that they be holy to Yahweh, i.e. to mark their consecration to Him and separateness from other peoples and gods. The priests are told not to make any baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard, nor make any cuttings in their flesh. They shall be holy unto their God and not profane the name of their God" (21^{5f}). While this command lays stress on ceremonial observance, these things are primarily forbidden because they are connected with the worship of other gods and are therefore a violation of the holiness of the worship of Yahweh.¹⁾ Similarly in chap. 17 it is prescribed that the blood of wild animals slain in the hunt shall be covered up with earth, for the reason, Peters points out,²⁾ to prevent it becoming an offering to the demons of the field. So also to eat the flesh of animals killed by wild beasts was to partake involuntarily in the worship of other gods by feasting on creatures sacrificed to them. "To the Hebrew, therefore, these were not primarily laws of physical cleanness, but intended to prevent any relation on his part with demons and evil spirits."³⁾

The same principle, it has been pointed out, underlies the laws

1) See Robertson Smith, O.T.J.C. p.366

2) Ibid. p. 366f Rel of the Hebrews p.296

3) Ibid.

4) Robertson Smith, op.cit. p.366f

of clean and unclean food.¹⁾ "The fundamental principle is not that of physical cleanness or of hygiene, but of the exclusive worship, the holiness, of Yahweh. For an Israelite to partake of certain animals was to connect himself with the worship of other gods or of demons, and thus offend the holiness of Yahweh."²⁾

These ceremonial rules have no ~~distinctly~~ ^{intrinsically} moral character. They could be called unmoral. They do, however, make for monotheism, the sole worship of Yahweh. Because they are "directed against heathen usages", though they may give the law a certain air of ritual formalism, there is, as Robertson Smith says, a moral idea below. The existence of other gods was too plainly a reality to this lawgiver, but in limiting Israel's allegiance to Yahweh alone, he was paving the way for later monotheism. The code, moreover, is beginning to differentiate between the character of Yahweh and other gods along moral lines. It was this moral differentiation which opened up the ethical road to monotheism.

Once ceremonialism has been admitted, however, even with this devoutly religious purpose, and has been laid down as a necessary command of God, religion ceases to be limited to the strictly ethical. Thus we find in the Code side by side with its high moral precepts, large sections of non-moral ritual, - all subsumed under the basic, "Be ye holy, for I am Holy."

1) Cf Robertson Smith, O.T.J.C. p.366f

2) Peters, p. 299.

In the same chapter that commands honesty, justice and love of neighbor the law stipulates that if the sacrifice of peace offering "be eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted; but everyone who eats it shall bear the consequences of his iniquity because he has profaned a holy thing of Yahweh's" (19⁷⁻⁸). This precept is in itself arbitrary and non-moral, yet to break it profanes holiness. Similarly a thank offering must be eaten on the same day it is sacrificed (22²⁹⁻³⁰); and other ritual regulations are laid down for wave offerings and the festivals (ch 23-25; see Commentaries for genuine H material). These regulations are intrinsically non-moral and arbitrary.

Chap. 22 contains detailed regulations concerning the use of "holy things." What qualifications render these things worthy of a holy use? Are they brought into a holy relation to Yahweh through the moral worth of them that offer them? Or is their holiness completely divorced from morality? The ethical psalmists and prophets maintain that the sacrifices of immoral persons are abomination to Yahweh, but we find no such idea in the Holiness Code. The only qualifications are physical fitness of the sacrifice, i.e. without blemish (22¹⁸⁻²⁵); and being eight days old (v.27). Detailed regulations restrict the "holy things" from a leper, or one who has a discharge, or is unclean from a dead body, or an emission of semen, etc. No layman

and only certain dependents of the priest may partake of them. Moral qualifications may be taken for granted but they are not mentioned. The stress here is entirely ritual. "They shall keep my charge lest they incur sin for it and die in consequence, through profaning it...You shall not profane my holy name, but I will be sanctified among you." (22^{9,15,16,31-3}). Yahweh reacts against these ceremonial offences just as strongly as against the worst immoralities. "Anyone who approaches the holy things which the Israelites sanctify to me shall be cut off from before me. I am Yahweh (21^{3f} cf 17^{4,9,14} etc.) This is the most severe denunciation the Code can use. In that these things profane the holiness of Yahweh, holiness is not entirely a moral quality.

The regulations for the priesthood bear out this conclusion. What qualifies men for this holiest relation to Yahweh? No moral requisites are laid down by the Code. Physical and ceremonial qualifications we do find. A priest must be physically without blemish (21¹⁷⁻²³). A flat nose or a club-foot disqualifies a man immediately, but nothing is said of requisite honesty or justice or love. Though these would of course be taken for granted, the stress is on the physical and ceremonial. The priest must not be contaminated by anything unclean (21²⁻⁸) and the chief priest must not marry a widow or divorced woman (21¹³⁻¹⁴);

nor let his hair go loose, etc. (21¹⁰). Ceremonial defilement renders him unholy e.g. touching anything, animal, or person who is unclean (21²⁻⁸ 22⁴⁻⁶ etc), or even such natural processes as seminal discharge (22^{4b}). Holiness, i.e. the relation to Yahweh and right to approach Him, can be regained after such contamination by ceremonial means, e.g. bathing in water (22⁶) or a special offering (22¹⁴); unless the offense comes under the more drastic penalty of the ban. The reason for the particular holiness of the priests is because they fulfil a ritual office, and their added holiness consists not in moral but in ritual cleanness. They are restricted from certain things allowed to others; the head priest must not do things permissible to his associates. Since these things are allowed to common people, they are innocent in themselves. The uncleanness they involve for the priests is something not per se but is superinduced upon them by the arbitrary command of Yahweh. That a greater degree of holiness rested upon such regulations and was "profaned" if they were broken, was a distinctly unmoral idea.

Holiness is, therefore, a concept applied by the Code interchangeably to the ceremonial or moral spheres. The lawgiver feels no incongruity in this. To be holy means for him to be devoted to Yahweh. This should apply to every phase of life. They must be Yahweh-worshippers only, carrying

on their cult according to the Yahweh ritual as distinct from that of other religions. Their conduct must be according to Yahweh's principles, (and here morality came in). Even their dress must be Yahwistic (Num 15³⁷⁻⁴¹) marking them off as His people. Their food, also, must be Yahwistic (Lev 11⁴³⁻⁵²²⁵) and it must be prepared according to Yahweh ritual (17). These people recognized a fundamental difference between Yahweh their God and all others. They felt themselves separated from other peoples and peculiarly related to Him. They tried to mark their separateness on the basis of their religion. Morality and ceremonial were both a part of religion to them; therefore, their moral s must be different, and their ritual must be different. They applied the same concept of holiness to both, and they ^{were} re-
garded of equal value and importance. (The same penalties and warnings apply to each). The greatest shortcoming of this code is not that it fails to hold up high moral principles as standards of conduct, but that it so conceived of Yahweh as to make an equal demand for non-moral ritual as for moral conduct.

The result was inevitable confusion to the moral sense. Placing the guilt of eating a sacrifice on the third day (19⁸) on a par with the guilt of incest, for example, shows the Code's failure to grasp the fundamental distinction between intrinsically moral rules and arbitrary ritual commands. This failure would make it impossible for its adherents to develop clear moral perception of what was

inherently right or wrong. The right thing would come to mean what Yahweh commanded, not what was right per se. This might have resulted in sinking religion to the level of mere superstition, obedience to arbitrary rules. What saved Yahwism was that the legislators of this code were beginning to separate Yahweh from the gods of other nations on the grounds of His moral character. They saw that in the ceremonial sphere as well as that of conduct ~~nothing~~ distinctly immoral per se (e.g. sacred prostitution, child sacrifice, etc.) was compatible with the character of their God, or could correspond to His commands. They had not gone a step further and seen that to a purely moral god, ritual commands divorced from morality, i.e. which were neither distinctly moral or immoral, could have no meaning or significance. This was to be the contribution of the prophets.

The concept of holiness being closely allied to the concept of divinity, it meant when applied to the moral sphere that quality of life which is compatible with a close relation to God, i.e. according to His principles. As Yahweh was conceived of as a moral and merciful God, this side of holiness became synonymous with morality. In the ceremonial sphere holiness came to mean that state or ritual condition which was necessary for acceptance by, a close relation to, Yahweh. In practice this side of holiness came to indicate

a physical quality, which adheres to persons or things that come in contact with deity. Negatively it implied a cleanness or freedom from all defilement, and on the positive side, what was holy was felt to be charged with an aura of divinity. As Whitehouse puts it: holiness might be regarded as the "nimbus or outflow of Deity" which attaches itself to everything that mediates in worship, whether persons or things, between God and His worshippers.¹⁾

As such holiness was a definite, positive quality, it became closely related to the antithetic concept of uncleanness.²⁾ Both holiness and uncleanness were dangerously untouchable and therefore tabu.

The Code gives as strict regulations that "holy things" be not eaten by profane persons (22¹³⁻¹⁴), as those stipulating that unclean things be not eaten by holy persons (20²⁵ 11⁴³⁻⁵). Not only must unclean persons not enter the sanctuary, but the head priest who is holy cannot come out of it (21¹²). On the one hand anything unclean is separate and untouchable; on the other hand what is holy is equally separate and untouchable.

As a consequence of this physical, non-moral idea of holiness, it, as well as uncleanness, was thought to be contagious. This is a very common idea among primitive

1) E.R.E. 6:758

2) W.R.S.- Rel. of Sem. pp. 425, 446, etc.; also Soderblom, E.R.E. 6:737f.

peoples as Robertson Smith¹⁾ and Frazer²⁾ have pointed out. Contagion would be absurd with an ethical idea of holiness. But here it is a quasi-physical quality derived from contact with, or relation to, Yahweh; and that which the divine powers have touched is unto the unconsecrated person fatal and terrible "as if charged with electric forces" (W. Robertson Smith). Thus the Code makes it fatal to approach the "holy things" having one's uncleanness upon him (22³).

All this is the result of an imperfect conception of God. Because He was thought of as one who delighted in the burnt-offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts, and who insisted that unwitting uncleanness disqualified one for approaching Him, etc., His own holiness as well as the sanctity which He required from man could not be conceived of as wholly moral; and such holiness would be thought of as violable by acts outside "~~that~~ moral law in the breach of which alone any insult to the divine majesty can properly be supposed to consist." By placing non-moral ritual on a par^h with morality as demands of Yahweh, ^{h/} these legislators show that they did not truly know Yahweh. Hosea might have been speaking of those whose beliefs and practice were represented by the Holiness Code when he said, "My people perish for lack of knowledge.... They do

1) Rel of Semites, p.146 et passim; App.C.

2) Golden Bough I 318-343 et passim.

not know Yahweh.... There is no knowledge of God in the land" (4¹, 65⁴ 6⁶); or Isaiah when he cried out, "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know; my people doth not consider." (1³).

The conception of holiness with its unmoral aspects is closely bound up with the conception of sin. As holiness became associated with cleanness or material purity; so its opposite, uncleanness, - ceremonial as well as moral - came to stand for sin. Whether the conception of holiness or that of sin was prior is difficult to determine. They seem to have emerged side by side from primitive conceptions of tabu,¹⁾ and we are not so much concerned with their origin, as with their significance in this Code where they are inseparably bound together, and where it would seem that both the conception of sin and that of holiness grew²⁾ out of the conception of God and His character. In turning

1) See "R.C.", Rel.Sem.pp.332, 405, 431, etc. Also Frazer, Golden Bough, I pp.167-171.

2) I do not mean to imply that in the origins of religion a conception of God's character precedes conceptions of right and wrong, of sin and holiness, or of tabu. This is a question entirely outside the scope of this paper. All that is here implied is that the particular ideas of sin and holiness in this Code are based on its conception of God. In the development of religion as the conception of God's character develops, so do his demands for man, and hence the ideas of sin and holiness. Of course the development is really reciprocal. As conceptions of right and wrong develop so does the conception of God's character: witness, for instance, what has been said of the monotheism of the early prophets as an "ethical monotheism" growing out of ethical conceptions.

therefore, to a more detailed consideration of the idea of sin in the Code and to the question of "un-sin¹⁾ning" or expiation of sin, we are really only dealing with another aspect of the same subject.

We have seen throughout the Code, that as Yahweh enjoins holiness, so He denounces all uncleanness; and "that which is unclean, be it person or thing is in a condition more or less offensive to God, and if to Him offensive, then sinful." ¹⁾ As holiness meant that state which was acceptable to Yahweh and had free access to Him, so its opposite, uncleanness (or as we would say "sin"), meant that which was unacceptable to Him, which was "cut off from" Him and all that was holy.

By saying that for sin H uses the concept uncleanness, this does not mean that sin was limited to ceremonial contamination; but rather that in this Code no fundamental distinction between moral and ceremonial cleanness has been recognized. A breach of the moral law or a breach of ritual observance equally renders the worshipper "unclean". We have seen, for instance, that immoralities, adultery etc. (18 and 20), cursing and blasphemy (24^{15f}), lying, stealing, false dealing (19¹¹) or other unrighteous¹⁾ or unjust acts (19 passim) cause one to "profane" (19^{12,21,19}) or to "defile" (18^{24,30} etc.) or to "bear iniquity" (20^{17,19}) or "to bear (the consequences of) sin" (19^{17,20,20,24,15}); - all phrases implying what we would

¹⁾ Montefiore, op.cit. p. 328

call sinfulness. These offenses are all inherently immoral. They warrant the just wrath of a moral God. Offenders shall be put to death (19²⁰20¹¹,15,16,27 etc.); their blood shall be upon them (20¹¹,16,12,13,27 etc); and they shall be cut off from Yahweh and His people (18²⁹20³,18 etc). But all this can be paralleled in the ritual sphere where equally strong language is used of ceremonial contamination. It also "defiles" (21²22⁸ etc), "profanes" (19⁸21⁴,6⁷ etc), renders one "unclean" (22⁴⁻⁶ etc); and warrants death for the offender (22⁹) and the ban of being "cut off" (19⁸). These ceremonial sins are likewise said to cause the offender "to bear the iniquity that bringeth guilt" (22⁹,16).

Thus as holiness was a concept applying interchangeably to the moral or ritual sphere, so also "iniquity" "guilt" or "sin" is used for both. This brings us back to the gravest shortcoming of the Code. By placing non-moral uncleanness on the same level as moral sin, the Code inevitably confused the conscience and clouded the moral perception of its adherents. By teaching that he who eats of his sacrificial meal on the third day (19⁸) is no less worthy of the severest punishment and has committed no less a sin than he who robs his neighbor or commits adultery (18²⁹ - Both shall "bear their iniquity and are "cut off" from Yahweh and His people) this code makes the breaking of an arbitrary non-moral rule of equal importance to the gravest moral turpitude. If

wearing a garment of mixed materials (19¹⁹) be represented to the conscience as sin, is it surprising that to the ordinary man sin lost any vital connection with morality? And when the taint of sin or uncleanness can be acquired "unwittingly" (22¹⁴) or is connected with certain purely natural (and to our minds "innocent") processes as childbirth (18¹⁹) menstruation (20¹⁸) or seminal discharge (22⁴), we can only expect to find it regarded "less as the guilt of the individual, the secret taint of his own heart, than as the pollution which affects the land and community of Yahweh" (cf 18²⁵ 20³). Where guilt is attached to what is involuntary or unintentional, it becomes a non-moral concept. As God's law is arbitrary, man's guilt becomes likewise arbitrary. Duties resting not upon their inherent rightness but only upon the command of God, would be obeyed simply because He had commanded them, and without any effort to know why, i.e. without trying to find out the character of Him who is worshipped or the reason why He has made such commands. This makes impossible any real consciousness of sin as an inner state of the soul, and likewise precludes any heart-felt penitence or remorse. Nowhere in H is a change of heart required for forgiveness; nowhere does he demand real repentance. Could one feel remorse for defiling oneself by tending the remains of his dearest dead? Could a woman "repent" concerning her menstrual period? Could any change

of heart be demanded for an offence that was unintentional? Yet since "atonement" must be made for these things as for moral failings, it follows that repentance and forgiveness in the Christian sense are not involved in it.

Another factor which tended to obscure any real personal consciousness of sin was that Israel was still considered as a people, the nation as the unit, not the individual. Sin brings down divine wrath on the community as a whole, not only individually upon the sinner. This is linked up with the fundamental idea of sin as contagion (e.g. 21¹¹⁻¹² 22⁴⁻⁶), - an idea utterly impossible with a moral conception of sin. The Code makes plain that without touching anything itself unclean, secondary contact with one who has will make another unclean (22⁵). Thus an unclean person can pass on the contagion of defilement until nations as a whole are spoken of as defiled (18²⁴), and even the land becomes defiled (18^{25,27,28}). If sin is contagious and can spread over a whole community, the sinner or he who is defiled or unclean must be put under the ban, must be debarred from the rest of the community lest he defile it. Therefore, whether one has violated the laws of sexual morality (ch. 18 and 20), or worshipped strange gods (18^{21,25} 20²), or whether he has eaten with the blood" (ch. 17), or partaken of his sacrifice on the third day (19⁵⁻⁸) - "that man shall be cut off from among his people" in order that the land be not

defiled and the community be subjected to the wrath of its God (17³,9,10,14,18²⁹,19⁸,20^{3ff},6 etc).

This shows that the consequences of sin were felt to be dire indeed. It suggests the superstitious dread of consequences held by primitive people in regard to any failure to please their God. There was not, as with us, felt to be a necessary causal relationship between the sinfulness of sin and these consequences, but rather, that sin (or uncleanness) as a breach of God's law, invited divine anger, anger which might know no bounds. Things were wrong because they displeased Yahweh. Men had~~not~~ reasoned further than that, or asked why these things displeased their God or whether they were wrong in themselves.

This being the case, the purpose of expiating sin would be to avoid Yahweh's displeasure and the consequences He would send upon the sinner or the community; there could be little thought of removing the inner sinfulness of the individual.¹⁾ "Atonement" would indicate primarily the necessity of coming before Yahweh only when properly fit, "like a subject entering the royal hall only when washed and properly attired." Salvation, if it can be applied at all to the Code, would not include the inner purging, forgiveness, and removal of Christian teaching, but would mean only such propitiation of Yahweh as to gain His acceptance and favor. This is shown by the words H used in this connection. The

1) Cf. W.R. Smith: Prophets p.103 "This notion of sin has no necessary reference to the conscience of the sinner, it does not necessarily involve moral guilt, but only, so to speak, forensic liability."

Hebrew כָּפַר (kaphar) probably comes from the root meaning¹⁾ "to cover" or "to cover over" (Cf. the Arabic kafara which has this meaning). Sin as uncleanness was a taint the sight of which called forth God's wrath. If it is "covered", God no longer sees it; as far as His wrath is concerned it is rendered null and inoperative. In its earliest usage the term would imply no moral connotation; but as sin and forgiveness became moralized, the same terms were used with deeper meaning. It is difficult, therefore, to draw conclusions from terms used; for the content of meaning in the terms varies.

H only uses the word kapper in the difficult verse 17¹¹²⁾ which states that "the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." But this does not say how it is that the blood as the seat of life has atoning effect. This verse and the question of blood atonement has^{ve} been much discussed by scholars.³⁾ Suffice it here to say that there

-
- 1) See HDB IV 128ff, En Bi.IV 4220, Piepenbring p. 311ff. Robertson Smith (O.T.J.C. 438f) maintains that "to wipe" or "to wipe out" fits its usage more precisely. Driver, however, points out that as used in O.T. it is of slight significance whether we start from the idea of "covering over" or of "wiping out". Either case implies a metaphor meaning to render null and inoperative.
- 2) See O.T.Theol., Dict.articles, H.W.Robinson. Rel. Ideas of O.T. Chap.VI, Schultz, A.J.T. 1900 p.271 seq; Moore in En.Bi.IV 4217 seq., Piepenbring p.315ff, etc.
- 3) 19²² and 23²⁸ where it is also used do not come from H.

is no evidence for a theory of "substitutionary atonement" involved in its use. Yahweh has commanded that the blood being the life, or the bearer of life, is holy, dedicated to Him and withheld from every profane use. This is not only the case where expiation is intended, but also in secular slaughter and in thank-offerings,¹⁾ etc. Because the blood as the seat of life would be considered supremely precious and of mysterious potency, it may naturally have acquired this connection. But to the legislators of H, the emphasis was doubtless in the words, "I have given it to you."---for this purpose. It was the God-given method of atonement and they did not reason why. That this or other regulations laid down by Yahweh were arbitrary was not of concern to H.

The Code does not provide for the expiation of all sin, or for the restoration to divine favor of all offenders. In 17¹⁴⁻¹⁵, for example, one who offends by eating blood is "cut off" while he who eats what is torn of beasts is only unclean till evening and by washing can then regain his cleanness. One sin can be "unsinned"; the other cannot. But it is to be noted that the distinction is not (as it is in P; **b**ased on the distinction between an intentional and an unintentional offense. In fact, the case where uncleanliness can be expiated, i.e. that of eating flesh which dieth of itself or is torn of beasts, is almost sure to be a deliberate offence.²⁾

1) Cf 17 etc.; also Lev 3,7^{11ff}

2) Cf. 24¹⁷. No distinction between murder and manslaughter.

The only other cases where definite provisions for making right an offense are provided are 22⁷, and 14¹⁴ and 24¹⁸⁻²¹. The first, relating to ceremonial offences, provides that where uncleanness has been acquired that soul shall be unclean till evening, then by bathing in water cleanness is regained and one can again partake of holy flesh; or a layman who has "unwittingly" eaten of holy flesh is required to restore it plus the fifth part added thereto. The restitution provided in ch. 24¹⁸⁻²¹ concerns moral sins and the principle is an "eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", or making good a beast "life for life". These are the only cases where the Code makes definite provisions of penalty and restitution. Other laws are either merely stated as such; or the death penalty is attached (e.g. 21⁹ 24¹⁶⁻¹⁷ etc); or in that peculiar phrase of H, the offender is said to be "cut off" from before me (Yahweh), or from among his people. (17^{4,9,10,14} 18²⁹ 19⁸ 20^{3,5,6,17,18}). The precise meaning¹⁾ of this phrase has been a matter of some dispute. Whether it involved the death penalty, or whether it meant excommunication, and just how it was to be carried out and by whom, are questions which need not concern us here. It is enough to note that this penalty involved rejection from Yahweh. Sin did separate men from God.

Were such offences, however, unalterably unforgivable? Were no provisions made for the restitution of

1) See Kennedy: Leviticus p.66-7, Gray: Numbers, p.84-5, Kuenen: Rel. of Israel II, p.276-7.

persons who sinned in slaughtering an animal without going to a Yahweh sanctuary, etc.? If excommunication was meant by being "cut off" was there no provision for lifting the ban? Though there are cases where the Ancient Israelites "cut off" and even stoned to death great offenders,¹⁾ one wonders whether persons coming under the ban through minor offences were actually to be "cut off" forever from the community and from any relationship to its God. It is barely possible that H may have originally included or assumed some such provisions for restitution²⁾ which P, in revising the Code, excised because he had worked out ~~the~~ his own³⁾ elaborate system of ritual atonement with its differentiation between deliberate and inadvertent sins, his regulations for the sin and trespass offerings, the scapegoat, and the ritual of the Day of Atonement, - all of which have no place in H's less highly developed code. At any rate, the Holiness Code as we now possess it does not go into the question of whether people who have been "cut off" can ever expiate their sin and restore their relationship to Yahweh and His people; and it is even a question of controversy as to what was meant by this penalty. It would seem, therefore, that H's chief concern for the removal of sin (unclean-ness) was not so much to secure forgiveness for the individual sinner, as it was to maintain the holiness (opposite

1) e.g. Achan

2) 22^{8,9} for instance give the impression of an offence for which no forgiveness or restitution is provided. 17¹⁵ however which condemns the same sin does provide for its expiation. Other similar provisions may have been lost.

3) See above p.⁴⁶~~88~~ footnote.

of sin or uncleanness; of the community at large, and particularly of the sanctuary, its accoutrements and priesthood. To attain this result the individual sinner could be "cut off" from among his brethren and H was apparently not concerned with his own individual reconciliation to God.

That R^h held out the possibility of forgiveness and restitution for the nation seems evident from his concluding chapter (26). Here we find several hints that restitution on the grounds of reformation is possible even after the most serious disobedience and punishment. The recurring phrase, "If ye will not yet hearken unto me..."¹⁾ (after sinning and being punished for it) seems to imply that Yahweh will accept them if they do hearken, i.e. the possibility of national "atonement" or reconciliation to God. Similarly in vv.40-42 it is said, "If then their heart be humbled and they accept the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant." This chapter, however, is, as we have seen, doubtless later than the legislation of the code which precedes it; and in this promise of restitution on the grounds of hearkening to God, it seems to indicate the influence of prophetic teaching. Moreover this restitution being national, it does not really touch the question of the expiation of a sinner's guilt.

1) 26^{18,23,27}

A Code such as H which deals with definite regulations and not with the theory of religion cannot be expected to discuss all such problems. Its view of the purpose and efficacy of sacrifice, for instance, is very vague; but because of the importance of this question in relation to the prophetic teaching, it cannot be ignored. H's references to sacrifice are all casual. He took it for granted. It had not come to be the highly specialized thing P made it.¹⁾ This is shown by a survey of his references to the various sacrifices and his conception of their apparent use. He often uses zabah or the generic term for slaughtered sacrifice, and unless followed by the qualifying term "of peace-offering" etc. it is not clear whether it denotes only secular slaughter (e.g. 17^{5,7,8}). The olah or burnt offering is mentioned in 17⁸ 22¹⁸ and 23¹² (23^{18,37} where it is also mentioned probably do not belong to H) and seems to signify a gratuitous gift made at any time, or in fulfilment of a vow (22¹⁸). The shelem or peace offering and the korban or oblation might be votive or free will (22^{18,21}). But neither nedabah or neder seem to have a very technical meaning. The same is true of the todah or terumah or ishsheh. We are not told of what these offerings consist or what relation they have to the other sacrifices. This lack of clear regulations is illustrated by 19⁵⁻⁸ compared with 23¹⁹ where one ^{implies} infers that the

1) As in the pre-exilic prophets and Deut. no mention is made of guilt or trespass-offerings

shelem is to be eaten by the worshippers and the other by the priests. Whether the fat of the peace offerings was burnt to Yahweh the Code does not say. The simplicity and vagueness of these regulations are in marked contrast to such meticulous rules as the Code elsewhere embodies, and it indicates that it took for granted a general knowledge of, and adherence to, the sacrificial system. The point at which the Code becomes definite concerning sacrifice is to preserve the kodashim from defilement, i.e. its concern is for the holiness of these offerings. (Thus 22^{passim}, 19^{5f} 22^{29f}, re disqualifying blemishes 22^{18ff},).

That Yahweh accepted sacrifice and that His favor was gained by it was an assumption of the Code. Again the legislators do not ask why. It was a God-given institution and that was enough. The reasons prompting the individual to make such offerings may have been varied: homage, gratitude, sense of duty, attempt to gain favor, etc. As to how they were supposed to influence Yahweh, cannot be said. There may have been the vague notion that in burning the sacrifice upon the altar the fragrant smoke as it arose into the air and vanished from sight conveyed the finer essence of the gift etherealized to Him (cf. 23¹⁸ "yielding a sweet savor to Yahweh" and the expression "food of Yahweh" 21⁶ 18, 17, 21²² 25). But this cannot be pressed because the expressions "sweet savor" and "bread of God" continued to be used even when it

had come to be realized that the quality which pleased God was the piety of the worshipper which prepared the food.

In some of the sacrifices, especially those which were to be eaten by the people there was probably also the element of a communion meal with the deity.¹⁾ H seems to indicate that most common sacrifices or burnt-offerings were accompanied by the other type of sacrifices which were feasts in which the offerer participated. In 23³⁹⁻⁴³ at the feast of ingathering the worshippers are enjoined to "re-joice before Yahweh seven days." Thus Schultz sums up the significance of sacrifices in this period by saying that it was "to offer God the honor and gratification which such offerings, according to the universal presumption, effected, - whether gratitude or petition was to be expressed, or vows made in time of need were to be paid; and 2) by the table fellowship with God, united with Him through the sacred life-blood of the animal, to enjoy and strengthen the assurance of his favor."²⁾

In not dealing with the question of the efficacy of sacrifice, the Code gives no definite indication that it could "atone" for sin; but at least it left room for a popular belief in such efficacy. Moore says, "There is no doubt that the Israelites in all ages believedⁱⁿ the efficaciousness of sacrifice to preserve and restore the favor of Yahweh....."

1) Cf Moore: En Bi. IV. 4217. This element is stressed by W.R. Smith, Jevans p.96seq. etc (See Bibliography)

2) A.J.T. 1900 p.269

Bad men confided in it as an effective means of placating¹⁾ God and persuading Him to wink at their unrighteous deeds." The Code, of course, holds up no such view of sacrifice, but its failure was to leave room for it. Having fallen short of a thoroughly moral conception of sin and atonement it made it too easy for immoral uses of ceremony to creep in. Thus the prophets faced a popular belief in easy expiation and restitution. If sacrifice was large enough it was considered as atonement for one's "transgression" or the "sin of one's soul" (cf. Micah 6^{6,7}). Against this view the prophets direct their attack.

Though we have had occasion to point out primitive and unsatisfactory aspects of the Code's teaching, we have noted too that it contains much that is inherently fine: its insistence that Yahweh was the one and only God Israel could worship; its setting up God Himself as the ideal of holiness and conduct; its underlying tone of earnestness and reverence; its recognition of the intrinsic unholiness²⁾ of unethical conduct; and its demand for mercy and love which goes beyond mere justice. Its greatest shortcoming was that it did not see the incompatibility between these things and the arbitrary regulations of non-moral ceremony,- a shortcoming so grave that in a later age this aspect of H was developed and enlarged to the neglect of his finer teaching.

1) En.Bi.IV.4221. cf. H.W.Robinson op.cit.p.147ff

2) See above p.27. In this connection Skinner says, "Moral precepts are also included and are expressly embraced in the formula 'Be ye holy for I am holy'... where holiness is presented as an ideal to be realized in conduct, and where this ideal is connected with the essential holiness of God (as in the phrase just quoted) the notion is already charged with ethical meaning" (HDB II p.398)

AMOS

Before considering the teaching of Amos and its relation to the ideas of H, the question of literary relationship arises. ¹⁾ Riehm as early as 1889 pointed out that Amos 9¹³ "the plowman shall overtake the reaper and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed," presupposes a knowledge of Lev. 26⁵ "Your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time." But if there is borrowing it is not certain which is prior. Moreover Amos 9¹¹⁻¹⁵ is considered later than Amos by most critics. ²⁾

Other striking resemblances have been pointed out: Amos 2⁷ "to profane my holy name" parallels Lev. 18²¹ 20³ 22³² etc. There is here the possibility that Amos is attacking the ceremonial idea of holiness such as the Code in part represents. Selling the righteous for silver, the needy for a pair of shoes, etc., these, not ritual, profane God's holy name. On the other hand, Lev. 19(e.g. 11, 12) etc. where unrighteous or unmerciful acts are said to profane Yahweh's holiness may be due to prophetic teaching such as this of Amos.

Amos 4⁵, the sarcasm: "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven" refers to some law such as Lev. 23¹⁷ (or 7¹³ 2¹¹ 6¹⁷); but can only indicate that these laws go back to very old usage. Similarly his reference to free-will offering

2) Sellin: Intro to D.T. p.169f. supports the genuineness of 9¹¹⁻¹⁵ maintaining that it originally stood after 7¹⁶⁻¹⁷ and that in presenting the glorious future of Judah it continued the prophecy of judgment against Amaziah as a crushing condemnation.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament I p.202

(cf. Lev. 22¹⁸⁻²¹ etc.), or with Amos 8⁵ "making the ephah small" cf. Lev. 19³⁶ "A just ephah shall ye have". Amos reference (7¹⁷) to a "land that is unclean" has been cited as showing his affinity to ceremonial ideas such as we find in H. This verse seems rather but biting sarcasm addressed to a priest who held such views.

Parallels with Lev. 26 are more striking: Amos 5²¹ "I will not smell in your solemn assemblies;" and Lev. 26³¹ "I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors;" (for "solemn assemblies" cf. Lev. 23³⁶ etc). Amos 9^{4a} "I will command the sword and it shall slay them;" and Lev. 26³³ "I will draw out a sword after you." Amos 9^{4b} "I will set mine eyes upon them for evil, and not for good" and Lev. 20⁵ "I will set my face against that man." Amos 2⁴ "Because they have despised the law of Yahweh"¹⁾ and Lev. 26¹⁵ and 43 "despise my statutes", "despised my judgments." Because the date of Lev. 26 is uncertain, even if these parallels could prove literary affinity, one would hesitate to assert that Amos, who was a man of great originality, was the borrower.²⁾

As the conception of God is fundamental to theology and all ideas of religion, the teaching of Amos strikes that of H most profoundly at this central point. Amos thoroughly ethicized the character of God. So intrinsically moral does he

1) Critics reject this passage, though Sellin (p. 169) defends it as genuine to Amos.

2) Cf. I.C.T. p. 151.

conceive Yahweh to be, that in his view He everywhere visits violations of the moral order, not only in Israel but throughout the world (ch. 1 and 2). To Amos Yahweh was primarily the God of justice and righteousness, ^{and these} ~~which~~ He uncompromisingly demands of men. To all this H would agree; he, too, demanded upright and just living in the name of Yahweh. But where Amos and the Code part company concerns the ceremonial sphere. Righteousness was all Amos demanded; H placed alongside of it the cultic ritual, ^{as} equally a requirement of God.

This is the key note of the prophetic teaching in its contrast to that of the Code. The popular view, in accordance with the teaching of H, assumed a certain unethical conception of God. Yahweh is thought to delight in sacrifice and the smell of offering (cf. Lev. 23¹⁸); He demands for Himself the blood of animals; and rejects from His presence any who have been "defiled" by ritual uncleanness (perhaps through no intention of their own); He has great concern for ceremonial worship, and His favor is thought to be gained by sacrificial offerings. When we come to Amos and the prophets, however, this unethical element in the conception of God is gone. Not once do they make an arbitrary or unmoral demand in the name of Yahweh. Whatever they may have thought of the cult as an expression of devotion, they did not think of it as a requirement of God to be placed alongside the moral. In their teaching the ethical element has become all-pervading.

"To them Yahweh's moral attributes were co-extensive with his nature, so that there remained behind no non-ethical residuum. He was the God of Righteousness, not merely of justice in a purely juridic sense, but of Righteousness in the more extended connotation of ordinary modern usage. Righteousness is the fundamental virtue of the prophetic Yahweh. Not only can His dealings with man never be inconsistent with this sovereign quality, they must always be its direct outcome and issue." ¹⁾ And man's relation to God and to his fellow-man must also be consistent with this same quality of Righteousness.

Hence in Amos and the other prophets we find an entirely different conception of holiness from that of H. As Kittel so well puts it: "As soon as God came to be conceived as an ethical being, kadhosh came to have an ethical content not because in itself it meant 'pure', but because it was applied to a deity to whom that quality was attributed. So Amos (2⁶⁻⁷) speaks of the unethical dealings of Israel as acts which profane the name of Yahweh. The 'holy' name of Yahweh is His name and His being as God of Israel and of the world, and since this being is regarded as ethical in essence the conception of holiness takes on that of ethical purity. When in Amos 4² God swears by His holiness, it does not mean by His majesty, and when in 6⁸ He swears by himself, He must

1) ~~SxHxRxExppx3x8x7x~~
Montefiore, op.cit. p.122

swear at least by His ethical majesty and sublimity." ¹⁾

Holiness, in itself, was not of chief concern to Amos. He did not think of it in the abstract as a separate entity or a material quality. The fact that Amos could speak of Yahweh as swearing by His holiness and swearing by Himself seems to indicate that he equalled Yahweh's holiness and His being as God. Having ethicized the conception of God, he therefore ethicized also the conception of holiness. He seems to have accomplished this second result, however, without having definitely polemised against the false idea of holiness. He did not work out all the implications involved; but he defined the nature of God in such a way that this conception must in time conflict with the common idea of holiness. It is in Isaiah that the direct polemic comes to the fore, and we shall see there that his conception of holiness was the result of a gradual evolution from its more primitive conception, an evolution corresponding to the growing ethicization of God's character, to which Amos made so large a contribution.

Amos does not speak in the terms of the Holiness Code, but his conception of Yahweh's demands as contrasted to what they are conceived to be in H, would give an utterly different connotation to the precept "Be ye holy, for I Yahweh am holy." Because to Amos God's nature is essentially moral perfectness, to be like Him, or to be holy, would mean moral purity and

1) S-H.R.E., p.316-7.

righteousness. This is exactly what he stresses, though he does not press his teaching into the same thought-forms as those of the Holiness Code (e.g. cleanness and uncleanness, holiness and defilement).

Amos strikes the fundamental note of prophetic religion when he pleads:

"Seek ye Yahweh and ye shall live"

and makes it equivalent to

"Seek ye the good and not evil, and ye shall live." (5^{4,6,14}).

This makes the duties of a religious life co-extensive with the duties of the moral life. "Hate the evil and love the good" (5¹⁸) is the underlying principle of conduct, and it is Yahweh's primary demand. "Henceforth," says Marti, "the closest union between religion and ethics is of the very essence of prophetic religion. The only proof that a truly religious man can give of his religion is a consistent moral life."¹⁾

The sins, and the only sins Amos condemns are moral: covetousness and dishonesty, cruel treatment of the poor and defenseless, open violation of humane laws, perversion of justice, selfish and idle luxury, immorality, and false swearing. He denounces harshness towards debtors, oppression of the poor, of widows and orphans; and condemns the sordid pursuit of gain or the greedy appropriation of another's goods. This humanitarian outlook is very like that of the finer

1) Op.Cit. p. 147

elements in H. But by limiting himself to what was inherently moral, Amos spoke directly to the conscience in a way the legislation of H could not. When he said, "Seek the good and not evil" he assumed that men knew good from bad; and his unsparing condemnation of their unrighteous and unmerciful conduct could not but have awakened a response in their hearts. The Code on the other hand resulted in confusion to the moral sense. By classing such things as menstruation and immorality together as offenses against the holiness of God, the onus of the latter could not but be weakened. H could therefore appeal to the fear of consequences; but it took the prophetic teaching to lay the foundation for real repentance. Amos himself did not go on to an emphatic enunciation of the doctrine of repentance, but by ethicizing ~~of~~ the conception of sin, he made possible a real heart consciousness of sin without which any change of heart or repentance is impossible.

The implication of Amos' principle that Yahweh's demands are limited to what is inherently moral led him inevitably to combat those elements of religion which were represented by the cultic sections of H. Kuenen and others make much of the opposition of the early prophets to the worship of Baal and heathen deities¹⁾ and the syncretism of such worship in the Yahweh cult. In all of Amos, however, there is almost nothing which undebatably refers to heathen

1) Kuenen: Rel. of Israel II, pp.72-83.

worship save verse 8¹⁴: The sin of Samaria, the God of Dan, etc. and even here scholars are not agreed upon the meaning of the reference. When Amos says, "Go to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal and multiply transgression"(4⁴) this need not imply that there was bull worship, or Baal-worship at these places. It is a far more fundamental thing Amos is hitting: the practice of religious worship itself. Not merely because the worship was directed to heathen gods, but because such worship was what it was did he condemn it. Amos gives this explanation: "Come to Bethel and transgress, to Gilgal and multiply transgression: Bring your sacrifices every morning, your tithes every three days," etc. "for this pleaseth you, O children of Israel, saith Yahweh." The worship is wrong and does not please Yahweh.

It is very difficult, however, to determine Amos' precise attitude to the cult. Did he consider sacrifice and ritual worship wrong per se, utterly incompatible with true worship of Yahweh even by a righteous and pure people? Or are such critics as Powis Smith correct when they affirm that "it may hardly be supposed that Amos would have done away with sacrifice and ritual entirely if he could. It was not ritual ~~entirely~~ as such to which he objected, but rather the practice of ritual by people who acted as though that practice fulfilled all their religious obligations. Amos would not have had them stop the ceremonial; but he did

insist that ceremonial without moral character and social justice was but an offence to Yahweh.¹⁾ Edghill in the Westminster Commentary, opposes such a view. He says: "The most remarkable feature of this indictment (of Amos against sacrifice and the cult) is that the prophet is in no sense attacking the loose morality too often to be detected in the professors of an orthodox religion, but he is attacking the religion itself. He is not, as in ch. II, denouncing the unhallowed alliance of wickedness with worship, but declares that the worship is in itself wicked. He is not condemning those who, while careful to conform to all religious observances, yet in their lives set all religious restraints at defiance. He goes further than this. He singles out not the bad things of religious people for his scorn but the good things of religion. 'Tithe is transgression, sacrifice is sin. If that is your idea of religion,' says Amos, 'then God will have none of it; and the more you multiply your services the more do you displease the very God whom you are seeking to please.'" This is a very extreme opinion.

W. F. Paterson, on the other hand, is sure that Amos and these prophets in attacking the ceremonial system are attacking the abuses, not the system which they have infected. "The people addressed was a sinful nation, persisting in its sins, and the repudiation of offerings at its hand by no

1) J. M. Powis Smith: The Prophets and their Times, p.50

means implied that the sacrifice would be equally unacceptable at the hand of a penitent and regenerate people (cf Smend ¹⁾ Alttest. Theol. p. 168). " Marti opposes such a view and speaks of Amos' "flat rejection of the cultus." ²⁾ ~~Mitchell~~, ³⁾ ~~however~~, ⁴⁾ ~~however~~, ⁵⁾ ~~however~~, says that it is only on account of "the moral unfitness of the worshippers. They transgressed, not in coming to Bethel, but in coming as greedy and cruel sensualists."

Against such a view W. Robertson Smith says: "It is sometimes argued that such passages mean only that Yahweh will not accept the sacrifice of the wicked, and that they are quite consistent with a belief that sacrifice and ritual are a necessary accompaniment of true religion. But there are other texts which absolutely exclude such a view. Sacrifice is not necessary to acceptable religion. Amos proves God's indifference to ritual by reminding the people that they offered no sacrifice and offerings to Him in the wilderness during those forty years of wandering which he elsewhere cites as a special proof of Yahweh's covenant grace (Amos 2¹⁰ 5²⁵)."⁴⁾ In contradiction to this, Kittel states ⁵⁾ "It is not historically correct that Israel brought Yahweh no kind of sacrifice during the desert period, for it left Egypt to celebrate a feast of to Yahweh at the holy mountain; nor is Amos' opinion that as a matter of principle neither sacrifice or prayer, nor hymn

1) HDB IV. p.335

2) Op.Cit.p.148

3) Great Men and Movements in Israel. trans. by C.A. Mnoch & C. D.Wright, p.240.

4) Amos: An Essay in Exegesis p.115

5) O.T.J.C. p. 287

should be offered to Yahweh. But when sacrifice and gifts stifled right doing, they should be omitted, that right doing^x be respected. Sacrifice as such was not rejected, but if it assumed a place beside or even above justice and morality, it had failed in its office of serving as a testimony of conviction. Amos did not discard sacrifice, nor did he wish to do so." Such contradicting opinions might be cited ^{to any extent} ad lib L/

Where sincere critics differ so profoundly, it indicates that the writings left by Amos are not themselves definite enough on this point; and from the too scanty evidence it is difficult to arrive at certainty.

In attempting to follow out the reasoning of Amos in this regard, the basis of his thinking would have been his conception of God. Yahweh's prime characteristic is righteousness; His character is perfectly moral. Being such, by His very nature He demands righteousness of His people, and can accept nothing in lieu of it. Amos recognized, as we have seen, that the sphere of righteousness is not ritual and ceremonial, but social and political. It means truth, integrity, justice, goodness to fellow-men in all the relations of life. The demand of righteousness is not something aside from religion, a minor part of religion, it is its fundamental law, its sum and substance.¹⁾ We can be certain, therefore, that the sacrifices of unrighteous men would be denounced by Amos as insult to God. Such sacrifices involved an immoral

1) 5²⁴, 14^f etc. Cf. Moore, En. Bi. vol. IV, col. 4222

idea of God and of religion. Amos could not have denounced the giving of bribes among men and yet sanction a theory of sacrifice which in substance was bribery of God. Men deceive themselves utterly when they think they can buy God's favor or His forgiveness. In Yahweh's eyes such observance is in itself transgression (4⁴). Israel's pilgrimages He hates; He despises their feasts, their offerings He will not accept, their songs of praise He will not hear (5²¹⁻²⁵). Yahweh will pursue to the bitter end those who thus worship him (9¹⁴).

Can we go even further than this with certainty? At least we can say: Amos would hold that sacrifice is never necessary to acceptable religion. Were the worshippers pure and righteous, even then religion could be carried on without it. Whether Amos would then denounce it, is another question, a question he probably never considered. But as Marti says, "No one of the prophets ever demanded the offering up of sacrifices as the sign of a religious life."¹⁾ In the mind of Amos, Yahweh stands ready to destroy utterly the nation's places of worship.(3¹⁴ 5⁵ 7⁹). "The high places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be ^{laid waste.} desolate;-andThe horns of the altar shall be cut off and fall to the ground." He could see the whole cult swept away that pure religion and undefiled might the better be carried on.

1) Op.cit. p.148

What would have been the character of that pure religion? - the seeking after righteousness, the seeking after God.¹⁾ But if we press Amos further than that, he has left us no answer. How would he have had God worshipped, what forms, if any, he would sanction; what type of corporate worship;- these are matters he never discusses. It is much not have had, than what he would more clear what he would put in its place. As Robertson Smith so well puts it: "If we ask what Amos desired to set in the place of the system he so utterly condemns, the answer is apparently very meagre. He has no new scheme of church and state to propose - only this, that Yahweh desires righteousness and not sacrifice. Amos, in fact, is neither a statesman nor a religious legislator; he has received a message from Yahweh, and his duty is exhausted in delivering it. Till this message is received and taken to heart no project of reformation can avail; the first thing that Israel must learn is the plain connection between its present sin and the danger that looms on its horizon....To produce conviction of sin by an appeal to the universal conscience, to the known nature of Yahweh, above all to the already visible shadow of coming events that prove the justice of the prophetic argument, is the great purpose of the prophet's teaching."²⁾ As Amos never faced the question of worship for a righteous and purified people, it must be recognized that his attitude towards ritual under such conditions is an

1) 5⁴,6,14

2) Prophets of Israel p.141

unknown quantity. That he would certainly have demanded that it comply with, or correspond with his fundamental idea of the divine nature is certain, and it seems, therefore, a legitimate conclusion that he would never have considered sacrifice as necessary. Whether it would have been allowable, perhaps even advisable under such circumstances; or what Amos would have put in its place;- are questions we cannot answer.

Before dismissing this aspect of Amos' teaching Duhm's criticism deserves particular attention. He maintains¹⁾ that in Amos morality or ethics has a far greater place than religion, and he goes on to say that religion proper²⁾ finds little or no place in the teaching of this prophet. He has here pointed out a real limitation of Amos, but he goes too far in stating that for him ethics supplanted religion. If such were the case Amos would not only sweep away the sacrificial system, but banish all worship. This is exactly what Duhm maintains: "Amos banishes all sacrifice and ceremonies, i.e. all religious actions in the real sense. The rigorism of others wanted the most simple and severe cult; but Amos goes even further. He would banish it altogether. In the place of cult, he sets what the cult lacked:- the righteous, morally ordered life, which alone pleases Yahweh.....Uncompromisingly Amos

1) Duhm. Die Theologie der Propheten pp.118-126

2) Duhm does not mean belief in God, but the relationship to him through worship.

rejects all outward demonstration or aesthetic expression of the friendly relationship between the people and Yahweh. He insists that the only expression of religion is the wordless consciousness of friendship ("dem wortlosen Bewusstsein der Freundschaft") and the corresponding life of righteous and humanitarian conduct.¹⁾ t/

Harper has said that "to have opposed sacrifice in itself would have meant opposition to the only method yet known to humanity of entering into communion with deity, in a word, the abolition of all tangible worship;"²⁾ and realizing this, Harper cannot think it possible for Amos to reject the sacrificial system entirely. Duhm seeing likewise that the rejection of the cultic ritual meant the abolition of all tangible worship, yet does not hesitate to assign this view to Amos.

Though, as has been pointed out, one cannot say what would have been the attitude of Amos regarding a purified corporate worship, we can at least say that a relationship to God was to him fundamental. He is no mere preacher of morality. "Thus saith Yahweh" - is his message, and he feels that Yahweh has a purpose to be vindicated in Israel and the whole world; His power is absolute, over nature (8^{8f} 4⁷⁻¹¹ etc.) and nations (1^{passim} 2⁹ etc.) Amos believed that through a relationship to Yahweh he had received an intimate knowledge of His will. "He believed that his commission

1) Op.Cit. pp.122-3.

2) I.C.C. p. cxix

had come to him through direct personal divine revelation and has stated this in plain terms (3^{7f}, ."¹⁾ Amos' own relation to Yahweh was exercised and maintained through prayer, for he tells us that he prayed(7¹⁻⁶). Was all this, which was open to him, not to be made accessible to his people? As a matter of fact, he indicates that such an ideal relationship to Yahweh had been Israel's during the time of the nation's infancy in the desert wandering (5²⁵2⁹⁻¹¹3¹²9⁷), a relationship maintained without sacrifice, but one that was ~~xxx~~ very vital and real. Amos seems to mean that the nation was then "in such a relation to Yahweh, so consciously dependent on Him and so much an instrument for carrying out His work that they could rejoice in His immediate presence."²⁾

No matter what Amos may have thought of temple worship, it is clear that a relationship to God of some kind was an essential element in his religion. In his thinking Yahweh looms so big that He towers above every realm of thought and action. To a God who had Heaven and Sheol at His command and disposed the nations to fulfil His righteous purposes in the world, the ritual oblations of man would sink into insignificance even were there no objection to them on moral grounds. Amos therefore regarded

1) Welch: Rel. of Israel under Kingdom, p.80

2) Ibid. p.88

the cultus as a relatively small thing, and he never formulated any consistent theory about it.¹⁾ Not alone does he demand the morally ordered life,²⁾ but his call is "thus saith Yahweh: Seek ye me, and ye shall live (5^{4ff})". Away with sacrifice and back to such an ideal relation to Yahweh as was had in the period of desert wandering (5²⁶). Do not think you can live without God and ignore His demands. No, "prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!" (4¹²).

In all this, the contrast of Amos to the teaching of the Holiness Code is striking indeed. In lifting the relation to Yahweh out of the ceremonial sphere he opened the door for personal, spiritual religion. He himself seems barely to have crossed the threshold, but he has at least cleared the way for others to go further. Though there still remained much to say about intimate, spiritual communion with God, Amos denounced the unrighteousness and vain reliance upon ritual which hindered it. In so doing he was moving not only toward a spiritual, but a universal religion. By insisting "that the primary justification for any act of the cultus was that it embodied human ideals, answered to ethical ends which were for all humanity, and recognising the moral needs of man as man, he parted, so far from national religion and was on the way to a world-faith."³⁾ This would

1) Cf. Ibid. p. 85

2) Duhm, see above.

3) ~~Ibid.~~ ^{Ibid.} p. 91, cf. p. 95. Amos's universalism is indicated in 9⁷ where the Philistines and Syrians, etc. are cared for by Yahweh. Also ch. 1 and 2 etc. A universal ethic as a religious principle leads to a universal religion. The prophetic influence in making religion spiritual and universal will be further discussed, especially when we come to Jeremiah.

have been impossible on the basis of religion as conceived by H.

Amos' insistence that sin, or what displeased God, was limited to intrinsically unethical actions, was a great advance; but because he stressed mainly things of outward and external conduct he failed adequately to grasp the inwardness of sin,¹⁾ and "the weary and heavy sense of how sore a thing it is for men to repent." Although he emphasized the justice and righteousness of God he neglected adequately to point to His love and tenderness which would invite men into intimate and personal communion with Him. These limitations he left ~~to~~^{for} his successors to overcome.

1) Cf. Wellhausen. Abriss p. 52, Duhm op.cit. p.120ff, Welch, p.91

HOSEA

Preliminary to our study of Hosea's teaching in relation to that of H is the question of literary affinity. A close investigation reveals such parallelisms as the following:

Hosea 1² "The land hath committed whoredom."

Cf. Lev. 17⁷ satyrs, after whom they go a whoring."

Also 20⁵ "I will set my face against----all who go a whoring...after Molech"(cf. Ex 34¹⁶ Num 15³⁹ Deut 31¹⁶)

Hosea 2¹⁸"I will make them to lie down safely"

Cf. Lev 26⁵"dwell in your land safely." and 26⁶

"Lie down and none shall make you afraid."

Cf. Lev 25¹⁸⁻⁹ "Ye shall dwell in the land in safety.... dwell therein in safety." (All the same word).

(Cf. Also Deut. 12¹⁰33^{12,28}).

Hosea 3¹- "Who look to other Gods" cf Lv 19⁴ "Turn ye not unto idols" (the same word) cf Deut 31¹⁸⁻²⁰.

Hosea 4¹⁰ "They shall eat and not have enough."

Lev 26²⁶ "Ye shall eat and not be satisfied" - the very same words.

Hosea 6⁹ "They commit lewdness" (zimm ah - a word characteristic of H occurring in Lev 18¹⁷ 19²⁹ 20¹⁴ etc.)

Hosea 7¹² "I will chastise them as their congregation hath heard." Cf Lev 26¹⁴ etc. "If ye will not hearken.....

then I will chastise you seven times for all your sins;"

v. 28 "I, even I, will chastise you seven ~~times~~ for all your sins." (the same word each time,. It would seem as if Hosea is appealing to some such known pronouncement.

Hosea 9¹² "I will bereave them" Lev 26²² "I will also send wild beasts among you which shall rob you of your children" the same word, shakol.

Hosea 11⁴ "I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws." Cf. Lev. 26¹³ "I have broken the bonds of your yoke, and made you go upright."

Hosea 12⁷ "Balances of deceit". Lev. 19³⁶ Just balances shall ye have." (the only reference in Pentateuchal legislation to "just balances").

Hosea 12⁹ "I will make thee to dwell in tabernacles as in the days of the solemn feast." Cf Lev 23⁴²⁻³ "Ye shall dwell in booths seven days" etc. Hosea seems to imply that the old observance of this feast had been given up, but God will yet again make them to dwell in tents etc. This may throw light on the statement in Neh 8¹⁷ that since the time of Joshua the children of Israel had not dwelt in "suk~~k~~oth." Hosea, however, uses a different word, "ohalim" (not "suk~~k~~oth" as in Lev. and Neh., k/

Hosea 13⁸ "The wild beast shall tear them."

Lev. 26²² "I will send wild beasts among you."

Hosea 1⁹ "Ye are not my people and I am not your God" also cf 2²³. Lev 26¹² "And I will.....be your God, and ye shall be my people."

Hosea 5¹⁵ "Till they acknowledge their offence" Lev. 26^{40,41}

"If they shall confess their iniquity" etc. The word in Hosea, ashem, really means to "confess guilt", very similar in meaning to yadah "confess" in Lev.

Hosea 9³ "The Lord's land". Lev. 25²³ "The land is mine."

In addition to these parallelism, in word and in ^{s/} phrase there is much in Lev. 26 which is similar in idea to Hosea. In Lev. 26 it is said that if Israel does not hearken unto Yahweh and perform all his commandments, calamity and punishment will come. Hosea likewise (e.g. 4^{3,6} 5¹² 7¹³ etc.) predicts calamity and punishment because Israel ceases to hearken to Yahweh and obey him; ^{but} Hosea's prediction of punishment lacks considerable of the bitterness and harshness of Lev. 26, for to Hosea God is a God of love. One element of similarity, however, is very striking: viz. both men indicate that in the period of punishment, sacrifice, etc. will be unacceptable to Yahweh: Lev. 26^{30ff} "I will destroy your high places and cut down your pillars... I will cause your sanctuaries to be desolate, and I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors." Hosea 3⁴ "Without sacrifice and without pillar, etc." cf. 2¹¹ "Cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons and sabbaths," etc. and ^{a/} 9⁴ "No wine offerings, neither shall their sacrifices be pleasing to Him. Their sacrifices shall be as the bread of mourners." Lev. 26^{41,44} refers to exile as well as Hosea.

Both refer to a return after confession of sin(Lev 26⁴, Hosea 14^{1ff}).

These parallelisms appear very striking. When they are carefully examined, however, not much weight can be placed upon them. A number of those quoted are paralleled by passages in Deut. and elsewhere. Most of the others could be accounted for by their heritage of a common language and tradition without postulating any definite literary relationship. A large proportion of these references are to the parts of H which come from the hands of the redactor R^h, not only to the older body of legislation going to make up the Code. If we assume a literary relationship between ch.26 and Hosea, however, it is difficult to determine which of the two has the priority. If Hosea 12⁹ is related to Lev. 23³¹⁻³³ it is easy to place the latter as dating from a much earlier time. But it is not so easy with the references to Lev. 26. Hosea 7¹² may really be a reference to Lev. 26 but one cannot be sure. It might conceivably refer (though on the face of it, it seems less likely) to Deut. 27 and 28, or the conclusion of the Book of the Covenant. The evidence is too scanty to conclude literary dependence. It does seem evident, however, that Hosea shows himself familiar with a body of law, ceremonial law even; though when he uses the word torah (4⁶ 8¹ 8¹²) he does not limit it to codified statutes and precepts, but thinks more generally of the will of God.

The underlying thought of Hosea, that the relation between Yahweh and Israel is a relation of love and of such duties as flow from love, gives his whole teaching a very different color from that of H. Both Amos and H would say, "Yahweh must be feared and obeyed, else surely He will punish" (though in their conception of what God requires, one would press His moral claims alone, while the other adds stress to His ritual demands.) Hosea, on the other hand, would say, "Yahweh must be loved, and if Israel but knew Him, it would love Him and want to do His will." - a fundamentally different approach to God and religion.

The starting point, however, of their religious thinking is the same: Yahweh has chosen Israel and set it apart for Himself. "I am Yahweh thy God from the land of Egypt and thou shalt know no God but me" (Hos. 13⁴). H began at the same point: "Unto me the children of Israel are servants whom I brought out of the land of Egypt: I am Yahweh your God." i.e. your only God (25⁵⁵ cf. 22³³ 18³ etc). "I have separated you from the peoples that ye should be mine." (20²⁶). Amos likewise "I brought you up out of the land of Egypt. You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (3^{1f} cf 2¹⁰). Yahweh has chosen Israel and it is peculiarly bound to Him. H makes this the basis of Israel's obligation to keep Yahweh's commandments (Lev. 19^{36b,37}). Israel is bound to obedience. Hosea sees in it rather

the reason why Israel should love Him. He too demands obedience ($4^6 8^1$), but it is ever the outcome of love (e.g. $12^6 14^1$). While H came perilously near setting up unquestioning obedience to a law which might be at times arbitrary and unmoral, Hosea urges the people to know the character of Him whom they worship and to understand why He expects certain things. Hosea is, therefore, ever urging r/ his people to know Yahweh; and as no other prophet he continually refers to history in order to demonstrate the character of their God. He denounces his people for their unthinking worship of One they really do not know ($4^6 7^{14} 8^{13f}$).

Yahweh is to Hosea as to Amos thoroughly moral in character. The sins he condemns are moral wrongs: swearing, breaking faith, killing and stealing, and committing adultery (4^2 etc). But more than this, God to Hosea is also love. The prophet proves this by his allusions to Yahweh's care for them throughout their history. He found them like grapes in the wilderness (9^{10}), and cared for them through the thirsty desert (13^5). When Israel was a child he loved Him (11^1), the land to which He brought them was His (9^3). It was Yahweh Himself who gave them corn and wine and oil and wool and multiplied their silver and gold (2^{8ff} cf $10^1, 11^{12^8} 13^6$). Yet they deserted Him at Baal-peor (9^{10}) and have ever since been faithlessly playing the harlot (passim). "The general drift of Hosea's allusion is always the same,-

to vindicate the patient, consistent love of Yahweh to His nation, and to display Ephraim's sin as a lifelong course of spurned privileges and slighted love."¹⁾ Hosea expresses this love of God to Israel in many beautiful figures of speech: a father's love for his child (11¹⁻³) the care of a physician who heals sickness (5^{13,15b} 6¹ 7¹); a farmer's care for his beasts (10¹¹⁻¹³ 11⁴); and, most often, the love of a husband for his faithless wife (1-3, 4^{10ff} 5³ etc), a love which continues though with base ingratitude she deserts Him and runs after other lovers.

But though Israel may be unfaithful, though punishment is certain, even this did not obscure divine love. Sometimes in an emotional outburst against the infidelity of his people, Hosea seems to say that Yahweh will cast Israel off forever and love her no more (e.g. 5^{14,9} 15). But when his message is taken as a whole (especially if we can agree with B. A. Smith, Cornill, Budde, Sellin, A. R. Gordon, etc. that ch. 14 is substantially Hosea's)²⁾ it would seem that these passages are but the momentary outbursts of an overwrought prophet, for Hosea returns to the conception of Yahweh's constant love. "Yahweh loveth the children of Israel, though they turn to other gods (3¹). Even if Ch. 14 be rejected one must recognize in Hosea's Yahweh a love which created the nation and which therefore cannot be satisfied with destruction.

2) Duhm, Marti, Harper, Cheyne, Guthe (3rd ed) do not accept this conclusion, however.
 3) W.R.S. Prophets, p. 165

Punishment there must be, but its purpose is to redeem Israel. Yahweh as a righteous and loving husband must put away his faithless spouse for a time because only thus can she be regenerated. Israel is disloyal and to maintain her as though she were not would be a lie, a disloyalty to love. Hosea therefore points to a future exile when Israel will be deprived of her other lovers and learn to know Yahweh, and knowing Him turn to Him in faithfulness. "Hosea still believed in punishment. Israel will have to go into exile; but it will not be due to Yahweh's punitive justice but to his redemptive purpose. Her sin will not merely be punished, but inwardly conquered. The stern prophet of doom has become the prophet of love, a love that is faithful in spite of the loved one's faithlessness, a love that punishes, but in order to redeem and restore. Henceforth he preached the deeply moral love of God, his inexorable moral demands, and his certain punishment of sin. But through all and in spite of all, love will triumph in the end, and the hope of the future is assured."¹⁾

It is to be noted that in Hosea the relationship between Yahweh and Israel though an intimate and tender relationship, is always conceived of as a relationship to the nation as a whole, not a personal relationship to individuals. Only as the individual is a part of the nation, does he partake in the intimate love-relation to Yahweh. It was the

1) Bewer: Lit of O.T. pp.45-96

people Israel that Yahweh found like grapes in the wilderness ($9^{10}13^5$) it is Israel as a unit that Yahweh knows and loves ($5^311^111^83^1$ etc.) It is Israel (or Ephraim, which is but another collective name for the nation) that Yahweh addresses ($13^914^19^15^14^15^36^4$ passim). It was the nation that sinned and therefore "died" (13^110^9); it is the nation that must be punished ($13^{7seq}10^69^{17}$ etc), and the nation as a unit that must turn again to Yahweh ($12^614^{1seq}5^{15}-6^3$ etc) Hosea himself must have felt an intimate personal relationship to Yahweh (e.g. 3^1 "Yahweh said unto me...."); but there is no evidence of any intimate communion between the prophet and his God in regard to his own personal life. All the communications he receives from the ^{Yahweh} Lord concern Israel, even Yahweh's directions regarding his personal life in chapters one to three, are for the purpose of his message to Israel. Hosea's greatest contribution to religion was the conception of Yahweh's love - relationship to Israel, but it was his spiritual successor, Jeremiah, who was to carry this into the realm of personal relationship to the individual soul.

In this aspect of his teaching is Hosea's most fundamental contrast to the Holiness Code. Because he makes Israel's approach to God so intimate and personal, a formal relationship to Him through cultic ceremony falls into the background. The love relationship between ~~the~~ Yahweh and Israel becomes the basis of his doctrine of sin and repentance.

By ethicizing the conception of God and His demands Amos had made possible a real consciousness of sin. By dwelling on the tenderness and loving care of Yahweh Hosea made it possible for heartfelt remorse and penitence to replace mere fear of punishment.

This fundamentally different approach to religion is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in the conception of ~~the~~ holiness. Hosea also speaks of God as holy (11^{9,12}): "I am God and not man, the Holy One in the midst of thee." Holiness, it has been noted, signifies something of the essence of deity and implies a separateness from what is not holy. In this verse Hosea says that though Yahweh dwells in the midst of His people, he keeps Himself apart. He is holy, God and not man. But for Hosea this holiness or separateness consists in His compassion and forgiving grace: "I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger; I will not destroy Ephraim: for I am God and not man, - holy.... and I will not come in wrath." The difference between the holiness of God and the lack of it in man is that God ~~an~~ will not come to consume and destroy when He has the right to do so. H (and Amos¹) would probably have said: Because God is holy, He will consume.¹⁾ With Hosea it is just the opposite: He is holy, God and not man, and will therefore not consume. The one has identified the holiness of God with regard for his own honor, the other has identified it primarily

 1) Cf. references to "cut off" Lev 18²⁹ 17^{4,9,14} 22³ 20^{17f} threats of punishment in ch.26.

with the exalted mercy and love of God. "Be ye holy, for I am holy" would mean a very different thing to this prophet.

In Hosea's relationship to Gomer, his love demanded but one thing: love, a loyal love which would express itself in faithfulness. So in the thinking of Hosea, Yahweh demands but one thing of Israel: love, a loyal love which would express itself in faithfulness. Hosea strikes this keynote in the first verse of his prophecy proper, the message of the book beginning in chapter 4. "Hear the word of Yahweh, for Yahweh hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor ¹⁾leal love, nor knowledge of God in the land." "Love I desire and not sacrifices, the knowledge of God, not any offerings." (6⁶) Yahweh demands that the heart of his people belong to Him, by no means that they may draw near to Him with their mouths or honor Him with lip service or external offerings. Though all the requirements He laid down might be fulfilled, Hosea saw that they were not enough and with words filled with deep pathos and tragedy still would he cry, "Woe unto them! They have not cried unto me with their heart; they only howl away for corn and wine beside their altars." (7¹³⁻⁴) While ²⁾He is largely concerned with externals; Hosea thinks of the heart: While the Code lays much stress on ritual cleanness, Hosea is primarily concerned with the fact that though they carry on the ritual, his people "know not Yahweh" (5⁴ etc).

1) G.A. Smith

2) Lev. 19¹⁷ against hating "thy brother in thine heart" is a beautiful exception. Indeed much of the moral and humanitarian element in 19 etc. is very fine; but it does not go far enough. The relationship to God is through externals, sacrifice, etc. It is not made a thing of the heart.

The writer of H has much to say regarding sacrifices; he assumes their efficacy. Hosea brushes them aside; he is concerned with something deeper: "Love I desire and not sacrifice; the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings."

This "knowledge of God" which has such central place in Hosea is almost a new conception. Amos would have said, "Justice and morality, not sacrifice" (Am. 5²¹⁻⁴); Hosea adds: "The knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings." Amos saw beneath the externals of the Holiness ritual. But Hosea saw too that beneath the external immorality which he and Amos denounced, and beneath the unfaithfulness of the heart which He himself condemned, the root cause, the fundamental lack was: "They have not known Yahweh." (5⁴). As Gomer did not understand and appreciate her husband, did not seem to know the real Hosea, so Israel failed to understand or appreciate Yahweh's care; they did not know the Lord: "knew not that I gave her corn and wine" etc. (2^{8seq.}). "They knew not I nursed them" (11³). The immorality, injustice, social evils against which Amos protested are equally condemned by Hosea (4^{2,11,14,18} 6⁸ 7¹ etc. passim), but Hosea probes deeper to the cause: "My people perish for lack of knowledge" (4⁶). "The spirit of whoredom is within them, and they know not the Lord" (5⁴). "There is no truth, nor real love, nor knowledge of God in the land" (4¹). In substance Hosea is saying: If the people only knew Yahweh, His love and care, they would not be unfaithful to Him. If they really knew

Him they could not indulge in immorality. And by this knowledge of God, as Marti rightly points out, Hosea does not mean anything merely intellectual, but "the fine feeling and perception of the divine Being and the divine strength in the depths of the soul, which of itself leads men to hope in God, and urges them to active love and faith, to justice and righteousness."¹⁾ Such knowledge of God involves the whole heart in inner devotion. Hosea makes hesed, "dear love", its parallel. Thus, to know God, is, as Harper puts it: "to feel the force of the deity and to act accordingly i.e. to have the feeling (of love or duty or whatever else) which a knowledge of God implies."²⁾

Hosea recognizes, that this lack of knowledge and the resultant immorality form a vicious circle, one causing the other. The lack of knowledge causes immorality, and immorality makes knowledge impossible: "Their doings will not suffer them to turn unto their God, for the spirit of whoredom is within them and they know not Yahweh" (5⁴) "Harlotry, wine and new wine take away the heart (or the understanding) of my people." (4^{11,12}). People who indulge in immorality have no understanding and "shall be overthrown" (4¹⁴). Their evil life is not only a result of the lack of knowledge, it is also an obstacle keeping them from God and further knowledge of Him. Having thus rejected knowledge (4⁶) they themselves must be

1) Rel of O.T. p.152f.

2) I.C.C. Amos and Hosea p.Cf. Cf. W.R.S. 'Prophets' p. 160f. and G.A.S.vol.I, ch.21.

rejected and punished (2^{9seq}) until "They shall cry unto me, My God, we Israel know thee" (8²)¹⁾ Then "I will betroth thee unto me forever; yea I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will betroth thee unto me in faithfulness and thou shalt know the Lord" (2^{19,20}). Repentance and turning from their evil ways, is inevitably bound up in Hosea's mind with a deeper knowledge of God and a closer attachment to Him.

Part of the blame for this lack of knowledge Hosea places at the door of the priests whom he denounces as a snare at Mizpah, and a net spread upon Tabor (5¹). Instead of enlightening^{ing} the people concerning Yahweh and His will, "They feed on the sin of my people, and set their heart on their iniquity" (4⁸). Therefore "Hear this, O ye priests and hearken ye house of Israel....for unto you pertaineth the judgment!" (5¹). "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me, seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God." (4⁶).

In this respect, be it noted, Hosea does not oppose the priesthood in itself. Amos would doubtless have been more drastic. But Hosea implies a definite function for the priesthood - declaring the divine law (4⁶ 8¹²). But the contrast between Hosea and H is vividly brought out in their attitude toward the priests. H stipulates as the first and

1) Though this verse as used in Chap. 8 is of course only the vain cry of a heedless people, it would express in this sense Hosea's deeper longing.

prime requirement that the priests and especially the chief priest must avoid ceremonial defilement (21¹⁻¹⁵); then follows the specification of bodily defects which disqualify for this holy office (21¹⁶⁻²⁴); and finally we have detailed restrictions imposed upon the priests in their enjoyment of their share of the offerings (22¹⁻¹⁶). The main concern of H regarding the priesthood is concern for their ceremonial purity lest they profane the name of Yahweh (22²). But while the Code indicates that God rejects as priests any with physical defects; Hosea denounces only their moral failings (4⁸ 5¹⁶ 9) and says: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge I will also reject thee that thou shalt be no priest to me..... because thou hast forgotten thy God's instruction I will forget thy children" (4⁶). Again the Code looks upon man's exterior; Hosea looks upon the heart and he has never a word regarding ceremonial regulations. To the priests religion had become what too easily the cultic regulations of H would make it, - a mass of ceremonies which satisfied the people and kept the priests in bread. "But to Hosea religion is above all a thing of the intellect and conscience; that knowing which is at once common-sense, plain morality and the recognition by a pure heart of what God has done and is doing in history. Of such a knowledge the priests and prophets are the stewards, and because they have ignored their trust the people have been provided with no antidote to the vices which

corrupt their intelligence and make them incapable of seeing
God.¹⁾"

Hosea. In his conception of sin, Hosea stands very close
to Amos. But while the view of the ^{latter} ~~former~~ was wider, con- ^{earlier}
demning foreign nations for their wrongs; Hosea, concerning ^{prophet}
himself alone with Israel, has the deeper view. Amos was
chiefly concerned with actions and he looked for justice;
Hosea's concern was the heart and he looked for "leal love".
The prophets and the Code are at one, however, in viewing
the basis of all sin as unfaithfulness to Yahweh. They have
this in common: both want the nation absolutely devoted to ^{2/}
Yahweh alone and acknowledging no other god. "I am Yahweh
your (only) God" says the Code and insists on His demand for
Israel's exclusive devotion. With this Hosea absolutely
agrees, and like the Code he holds that forsaking Yahweh is
an ultimate sin. Idolatry or the worship of heathen gods is
condemned in both (Lev. 19⁴ 26¹ 18² seq and Hos. 4¹⁷ 8⁴ 13² etc.)
It is to be noted, moreover, that both Hosea and H use the
figure of harlotry or whoredom in referring to the apostasy
of such false worship (Lev. 17⁷ 20⁵ Hos. 5³ 9¹⁰ etc. passim);
and both speak of it as "defiling" (Lev. passim; Hos. 5³
"Ephraim, commit whoredom, Israel is defiled"). Yet though both ^{3/}
agree in denouncing the acknowledgement or worship of other
gods, they cease to agree when we turn to what they hold out
as the content of positive allegiance to Yahweh and the way
this is to be maintained. H is largely concerned with

precaution against cultic contamination and with the regulations for carrying on the proper ceremonial worship of Yahweh. Hosea, on the other hand, is not at all concerned with this, but insists rather upon real knowledge of God and the faithfulness to Him of heart devotion.

Such faithfulness must extend to the political realm. Seeking alliance with foreign powers was desertion of her husband and protector; it was unfaithfulness to Yahweh and therefore sin (7¹¹⁻¹³ 8⁹). "Woe to them! they have wandered from me." Not only did an alliance with another power mean for that day a certain recognition of, or even homage to the deities of that power, but Hosea saw that it meant in itself a questioning of the power of Yahweh. As in the religious realm of ascribing to Baal 2⁵ the source of the blessings that came from Yahweh 2⁸ was unfaithfulness and sin; so in the political realm, ascribing power to Egypt or Assyria implied the powerlessness of Yahweh and a turning from Him. Again "they know not Yahweh" (5⁴). Without understanding Yahweh they are like a silly dove. (7¹¹).

As was noted above, Hosea considered the nation as a unit personality. This affects his conception of sin, and it is the nation's unfaithfulness Hosea condemns, not that of the individual. He sometimes deals with a class of people (e.g. priests); but he does not really touch the individual conscience save as the individual is partaker of the common guilt. So too, Hosea's conception of repentance and expiation of sin is on a national rather than the personal plane.

Where sin could be conceived as ceremonial as in H, its expiation would be of a ceremonial nature. Where sin was conceived primarily as a breach of moral conduct as in *im/* Amos, it could only be removed by the righting of wrongs and a return to justice and morality: "Seek good and ye shall live" (5¹⁴). But whereas in Hosea, sin becomes a thing of the heart and is unfaithfulness to God, expiation and atonement will depend upon a change of heart and a return in faithfulness to Yahweh. It is hardly true that Hosea was "the first preacher of repentance," ¹⁾ however; for others had included an element of repentance and renewed faithfulness to Yahweh in their teaching. But Hosea asks no more; repentance is enough. No offering is essential (though he may have let men sacrifice as evidence of their repentance). The fault with the ceremonial system was that repentance became cluttered beneath much regard for the ritual aspects of "un-sinning," a casual incident almost. Until the conception of sin was thoroughly moralized, repentance was impossible. ²⁾ Until it was made a thing of the heart and God was seen to be a God of love, there could be no true turning to Him and yielding to Him the heart. *re/* "It is because Hosea's doctrine of God is so rich and tender, that his doctrine of repentance is so full and gracious."

Repentance must be deep and wholehearted, and Hosea particularly impresses this fact. Amos had said "Seek Yahweh

1) G. A. Smith

2) See above p. 41 f., 59

and ye shall live," but he had not taught Israel all that was involved in turning to God. Hosea condemns his people for the glib way in which they speak of returning to Yahweh and are sure of acceptance (6^{1ff}, 7¹⁴). "They have not cried unto me with their hearts." Hosea does not merely say, "Turn, thou to thy God," but he adds "And wait on thy God continually" as well as "keep kindness and justice." (12⁶). Repentant Israel must come with words of confession and deep penitence, acknowledging the vanity of idol worship and the folly of seeking help from foreign powers, and professing allegiance to Yahweh alone (12^{2f}).

to In all this Hosea demands nothing ceremonial, no sacrifice or offerings. Rather, "We will render as bullocks the offerings of our lips" - words of confession and penitence. The sacrificial system is no essential to Hosea. In determining his precise attitude towards the cult and worship, his thinking may be divided into three phases. In the first place he denounces in no uncertain terms all worship of gods other than Yahweh, a thing which he likens unto whoredom and the desertion of one's true spouse for other paramours. (1² 2⁸ 9¹ 2¹³ 11² 13¹). In the second place, Hosea attacks the Yahweh-worship for absorbing into its cultus heathen elements which are not part of the true worship of Yahweh. This includes the attempt to represent Yahweh in the form

2) Cf. Welch op.cit. p.125-6.

of images¹⁾ (8⁴⁻⁶ 11² 10⁵⁻⁶ 13²); the kedeshoth or sacred prostitutes, and other sensual elements of cultus taken over from Canaanitish worship²⁾ (10¹⁻² 4^{13,15} 8¹¹). So far Hosea and H are at one, for the code likewise condemned the worship of other gods or the assimilation of its practices (Lev 19⁴ 26¹ 18^{1-5,24-30} 20¹⁻⁸). But Hosea goes farther, he maintains that all cultic worship even though Yahwistic in its ritual, can not constitute religion, but is at most only a form of expressing inner religious feeling. If religion of the heart is absent cultic worship becomes abomination. Though Ephraim multiplies its altars, they become but sin (8¹¹) for they pay no heed to the torah of God (v.12) Israel hath forgotten his maker (v.14). "As for the sacrifice of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it, but the Lord accepteth them not." Why? Because "Yahweh remembers their iniquity and must punish their sins" (v.13).¹ Hosea may have believed in the cult as an expression of the heart's devotion; but certainly not as a substitute for it. With this the finest adherents to a ceremonial law like H would have agreed; but the fault of such a code was that it did not make this unequivocally plain. Hosea does. He insists that the important thing is not sacrifices but the love-relation to Yahweh. His repentance demanded no sacrificial offerings. Recognizing the dangers in cultic worship, its easy formalism and mechanical approach to God,

1) Cf. W.R.S. Prophets 176-7.

2) Cf. Kautzsch: Rel. of Israel HDB V p.644-8; Harper: I.C.C. Hosea p. CLI

he put ~~it~~ to the fore the essential thing, a change of heart and an inner, personal relationship to Yahweh: "Love I desire and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." (6⁶).

Jachin But though Hosea recognized the danger and limitation of the cult, he also recognized its value. "He saw what, if it had been purified, it might have done and might still do to impress the minds of the worshippers with the nature and will of the God whom they worshipped. The searching nature of the examination to which he submitted the worship, and the persistence with which he returned to the question, prove how deeply he was impressed by the power which the cult had over the minds of men."¹⁾ Such verses as 3⁴ and 8³⁻⁴ show that, in Hosea's mind the cessation of all sacrifices and cultic services, was considered a great calamity. The punishment of Israel is described in such terms: "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies" (2¹¹) "For the children of Israel shall abide many days....without sacrifice and without Massebah, without ephod or teraphim" 3⁴ cf 5⁶ This cessation of the cult he views as a calamity. Describing the future condition of Israel in exile, Hosea speaks thus of the offering of the first-fruits and sacrifices: "They shall not pour out wine to the Lord, neither shall they be pleasing unto him: Their sacrifices shall be, unto them as the bread of mourners; all

1) Welch: op.cit. p.125

that eat thereof shall be polluted; for their bread shall be for their own appetite; it shall not come into the house of Yahweh." 9⁴. These references to unclean food, sabbaths, ~~feasts~~, etc. when understood in the light of Hosea's larger teaching do not indicate, however, that he was a ceremonialist in any such sense as H. In Hosea's mind, living in a foreign land meant for Israel expulsion from Yahweh's house. Hence its food came to it, no more as in chap. 2, from the grace of God, but one might almost say, from His wrath. Not taking its food from Him, exiled Israel cannot acknowledge it by giving Him reshith, etc. The services of the cult, sacrifice; votive offerings, tithes, assemblies, feasts (2¹¹ 9⁴ etc), he regarded only as means by which the people might express their dependence upon God's mercy, and their gratitude for His care. The calamity was not in the cessation of these outward ceremonies but in the inner state which that implied.¹⁾

In Hosea's attitude toward the cult he distinguishes clearly between what is good in it and what is not. He does not repudiate it altogether²⁾ but he gives it its rightfully subordinate place. All ritual that is inconsistent with his conception of God's character must be swept away, while he retains anything that would be helpful to man in his worship of the living God.

1) Cf Harper I.C.C. p. 329

2) Welch p. 129 and note p. 270.

ISAIAH

Isaiah is commonly spoken of as the prophet of holiness. At his inaugural vision the seraphs sing:

Holy, holy, holy is Yahweh of hosts;

The whole earth is full of his glory.

This song becomes an epitome of a large part of Isaiah's own message. Yahweh is to him "the Holy One of Israel" (1⁴ 5^{19,24} 10^{17,20} 12⁶ etc.), and though he never betrays knowledge of the specific legal precept, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," the principle it involves permeates all his writings.

Critics point out that by Isaiah's time the word kadosh (קדוש) had become a general term signifying that which was set apart as divine or having to do with divinity, in contrast to the human or mundane. It was, as Robertson Smith says, "the most comprehensive predicate of the Godhead."¹⁾ But just because the term had become capable of such wide and inclusive meaning, it is all the more difficult to determine what in particular it connotes when used by Isaiah. This is abundantly evident when one considers the interpretations critics have given to his use of the term.

Dillman thinks that in Isaiah holiness is practically synonymous with divinity, not so much a quality of God's

1) Prophets p.224; cf. also G.A.S. Isaiah 1927 vol.1, p.63

character as a definition of His essence.¹⁾ Against this view ~~see~~ ²⁾ Duhm ~~who~~ sees in Isaiah's use of the term not a comprehensive conception of Godhead but mainly an embodiment of religious awe and reverence. Kirkpatrick in discussing Isaiah's inaugural vision says that holiness is here expanded "to include the whole essential nature of God in its moral aspect... His purity and His righteousness, His faithfulness and His truth, His mercy and His loving-kindness, nay, even His jealousy and His wrath, His zeal and His indignation,- these are the different rays which combine to make up the perfect light of holiness."³⁾ Others point out as central in Isaiah's conception of holiness his feeling of the tremendous exaltation of Yahweh, His physical majesty and power, ~~or~~ even His brightness and dazzling glory. In the face of this varying opinion, it will be necessary, in order to determine Isaiah's precise meaning of the term, to examine it in his usage and to consider his conceptions of God and religion which bear upon it. As Welch says: "The sense of the word in its general use was wide enough to include all the attributes which are assigned to the Godhead; its peculiar significance to each prophet must be determined by the divine characteristics on which he laid stress as of special importance."⁴⁾

1) Der Prophet Jesaja p. 56-57

2) Jesaia p.4

3) Doctrine of Prophets p.177.

4) Rel of Israel p.145

The first significant reference in the book as it now stands is 1⁴ "Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that deal corruptly they have forsaken Yahweh, they have despised the Holy One of Israel."¹⁾ In the LXX this verse is even stronger ending "ye have angered the Holy One of Israel". If this rendering be pressed, it means that a people's sins, their iniquity and evil doing, their corrupt dealing, - these things provoke the anger of the Holy God. But even apart from the LXX, the Hebrew implies the same meaning. The whole poem indicates (as Gray points out) that Isaiah had ethical offences in mind. In these offences ("iniquity" and "corrupt dealing") the people "have forsaken Yahweh, they have scorned the Holy One of Israel." Isaiah is pointing out that Yahweh in His holiness is angered by, or is incompatible with, iniquity and corruption. Ethical offences are set over against the Holy God.²⁾

Compare 5¹⁶ "Yahweh ^{Zabaoth} (of Hosts) is exalted in justice; the Holy God shows himself holy through righteousness." Unfortunately its genuineness has been suspected.³⁾ Certainly the previous verse is an interpolation but as Gray points out there is a plausible connection between this verse and verse 14: "the holiness of God is revealed through His righteousness, His righteousness through His judgment on His own people

21) Dillmann in discussing the term "Holy One of Israel" points out that it means not the God who is holy to Israel, but the holy God to whom Israel belongs. See Der Prophet Jesaja p. 56f. ^{Clause}

12) The last ~~clause~~ of the verse I omit. It is not in LXX and probably not original. Cf. Gray, Skinner, Marti etc.

3) ~~12.6. P. 93~~ By Marti, Kittel, Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, Cheyne, etc. *et*

and city (v.14) who have violated His demands for justice and humanity (cf. 5⁷).¹⁾ If we can consider this verse a true representation of Isaiah's thought,²⁾ it comes very near to a definition of Isaiah's conception of holiness. Yahweh is exalted, set apart, and transcendent above everything human and earthly; the Holy God shows himself holy through righteousness. Isaiah associates holiness with righteousness and moral purity. In 3⁸ (an undoubtedly genuine passage), "the eyes of His glory" are provoked at the sight of wrongdoing, and such wrongdoing brings down destruction upon the people.

En 29²³³⁾ "When his (Jacob's) children behold the work of my hands in their midst, they shall hallow (sanctify, count holy, - ~~W 77~~) my name; they shall hallow the Holy One ~~W~~ of Jacob and stand in awe of the God of Israel," the thing that warrants Israel counting God holy is not His exclusiveness, His physical majesty or transcendent glory alone; rather it is that the Holy One is exalted in judgment, showing himself holy through his righteous and merciful dealings with Israel. The previous passages seemed to flavor of Amos with his insistence on righteousness and justice, here is a hint of Hosea (e.g. 11⁹ where Yahweh shows himself holy because of His mercy and compassion). The work of Yahweh

1) I.C.C. p.93

2) Even critics who consider it spurious, view it as a gloss from other Isaianic material.

3) Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, Skinner, Box question its authenticity.

in preserving and regenerating Israel, in "washing away the filth of the daughters of Zion" ($\chi 4^{3-4}$), - this work will cause Israel to recognize His holiness and to hallow Him.

Whether 29²³ is genuine or not, there is no doubt concerning the similar verses in 8¹²⁻¹³

"Nought that this people call holy
Shall you call holy;
And what they fear you shall not fear,
Nor shall you dread!
But the Lord of Hosts - him shall you call holy;
He shall be your fear, and he your dread." 1)

This translation of verse 12 depends, however, upon the emendation of $\gamma \psi \rho$ (a conspiracy) to $\psi \pi \rho$ (holy) suggested by $\gamma \psi' \gamma \rho \pi$ (v. 13^a) and, as Gray points out, is strongly favored by the narrower context. If it can be accepted as valid, this verse is direct evidence of the contrast between Isaiah's conception of holiness and that of the people of his time, a contrast borne out by such passages as Chapt. 1 where the religious worship of his day is set over against the true requirements of a holy God. "Not what this people call holy, but Yahweh in His transcendent purity and moral righteousness. He alone shall you hallow." One might read into these verses a direct polemic against the view of holiness represented by the Code, but because of the uncertainty of translation, such a conclusion cannot be pressed.

17⁷ -8 "On that day will a man look to his Maker;
2)

and his eyes will turn to the Holy One of Israel; He will

-----666666-----

1) Trans by Alex R. Gordon. cf. Gray in I.C.C. for trans. of v. 12. So also Secker, Lowth, Lagarde and Stade

2) Cf. 10²⁰

look no more to the altars, nor turn to the asherah and chammanim, which his fingers have made." Because of their

position these verses have been suspected; ¹⁾ yet they may

be genuine though misplaced, ²⁾ or were perhaps added by Isaiah himself at a later time as Skinner suggests. Certainly in the spirit of Isaiah they contrast the prophetic and cultic views of religion. No more in the cult and its man-made accoutrements but in turning directly to the ^{God} Holy does Isaiah see the future ideal of religion. re/

Such Messianic passages as 4^{3,4} and 29¹⁹⁻²¹ also have bearing upon Isaiah's conception of holiness, if we can believe in their genuineness. Into the question of the authenticity of such Messianic passages it is not our purpose to go. The pendulum of criticism seems to be swinging more in favor of their genuineness. Without pressing this conclusion we can consider what evidence they offer regarding Isaiah's conception of holiness.

The passage in Chap. 4 seems especially significant: "Everyone who is left in Jerusalem shall be called... holy.....when Yahweh shall have washed away the filth of ^{the Lord} Zion's daughters, and have purged Jerusalem's blood-stains from her midst by a blast of judgment and a blast of destruction." The prophet is saying that holiness will only be possible after the moral filth of the people has been washed away and the dross of their iniquity has been consumed as in

1) e.g. by Cheyne, etc.

2) See Gray I.C.C., so also Box

fire. The lawgiver would have agreed that holiness and filth are incompatible. He would have thought of both holiness and filth in the physical, or ceremonial sense. Isaiah is using old thought forms to express new meaning. Washing or burning are but a figure of speech for him. He has moralized the conception of holiness, and by filth means moral filth. Isaiah says that Holiness and filth are incompatible but it is clear that he does not mean the ritual contamination of which H speaks. This passage illustrates another phase of Isaiah's thought: the holiness of God and His demand that his people be holy, - these in themselves require His judgment upon iniquity, His blast of burning and extirpation. Yahweh must vindicate His holiness by the chastisement of His people's sins. And too, it is here seen that this is done for the purpose of regeneration, of making holy those that will be left in Jerusalem. This shows a direct relationship between the large amount of Isaiah's doom prophecies and his fundamental conception of holiness. As the righteous God of Amos punished unrighteousness wherever He found it, so the Holy God of Isaiah is exalted in judgment, and shows Himself holy through righteousness. But his judgment (and "blast of destruction") - and in this Isaiah seems to have learned from Hosea - are for the purpose of redemption, to make holy those that remain. As in his inaugural vision Isaiah felt that before he could be of use to the Holy God his uncleanness must be purged

away (6^{6f});- so "before a people can be the people of God, their iniquity must be punished and driven out of them.

The awful severity of such judgment is a consequence of Yahweh's holiness.¹⁾"

The now much doubted chapt. 33 contains a passage somewhat parallel to that quoted above and having to do with the blast (or "fire") of judgment and destruction: "Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire?..with everlasting burnings? He that walketh uprightly and speaketh righteously -- that despiseth the gains of oppressions,- and the taking of bribes -- and shutteth his eyes from looking on evil." Only those free from moral iniquity "shall dwell on high" or exist in the presence of the Holy God. The older and more primitive notion of God as a "consuming fire" (cf. Deut 4²²⁻³ Josh 24¹⁹⁻²⁰ I Sam 6²⁰) has been sublimated and ethicized so that in this passage as in Isaiah's inaugural vision, God's holiness becomes a fire devouring wrongdoing and injustice and purifying the doers of evil.

Another Messianic passage somewhat parallel to 4³⁴ is ch. 29¹⁹⁻²¹ telling how "the meek shall increase their joy in Yahweh and the poor shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel." Why? Because moral iniquity shall be wiped away and moral purity restored: "the terrible brought to naught", "the scoffer to cease," the iniquitous and the

1) G.A.Smith Isaiah in H.D.B. vol.2,p.491

unjust cut off. Again it is moral purity which is necessary before Israel can "rejoice in the Holy One."

These passages have all contained some form of the word holy (kadosh) but a further understanding of this term as used by Isaiah will be gained by a survey of those things which he condemns as being incompatible with (the holy) God. As in the case of Amos these things prove to be limited to the moral sphere; the burden of his message is, "Woe to the wicked!" (5¹¹ cf 1⁴ etc) or to "them that work iniquity" (31²) Or on the positive side: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (1¹⁶⁻¹⁷) The moral element is foremost.

The God of Isaiah, a holy God, looks for justice and condemns injustice and oppression. (5⁷ 11^{7,21,27} 29²¹ 28¹⁷ 32^{1,16} 10² 1²³). The holy God is to Isaiah the embodiment of morality and the principles of ethical right. Injustice is wrong, a holy God condemns it utterly. But that is not all. It is not a steel-like, legal justice alone which God demands. Though one may have right on his side, he must not oppress others or by pressing a just claim hurt the needy and poor: "What mean ye that ye crush my people and grind the face of the poor? saith the Lord Yahweh of hosts?" (3¹⁵ cf 5⁷ 10² 1^{23,17} 3¹²). The God of Isaiah condemns those that by waxing rich and gaining land for themselves deprive

others of their sufficiency(5⁸). Ethical right is fundamental; but more, regard for others is essential.

Lying and dishonesty is likewise condemned by Isaiah 5^{18,23,28,15,30}^{9,10} especially in its application to the taking of bribes.(1²³ 5²³). Drunkenness is repeatedly denounced (5^{11,12,28}^{1-4,7-8}).

Not only these overt sins and manifestly unethical things come under the prophet's denunciation; but also the more subtle sins of pride and willful hardness of heart. The denunciation of the wanton women in their vanity and haughtiness is one of the most vivid bits in Isaiah (3¹⁶seq), as is also the passage in 2¹¹⁻¹⁷ depicting the day that will come upon all the proud and haughty. Pride and arrogance is frequently condemned (10^{13-17,33} 22⁹⁻¹¹ 30¹⁶ 31¹ 28³). Woe to them, also, that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight! 5²¹ or who despise the word of the Holy One of Israel 5²⁴¹⁴. Compare also the denunciation of scoffers in 28^{9-14,22} or the wilful hardness of heart of those who "will not hear the law of Yahweh"(30⁹ and 5¹²) and "hide their counsel from the Lord" (29¹⁵). Callous thoughtlessness, ease, and the indifference of "careless" people is denounced (32⁹⁻¹⁴ 22^{11b-14}).

The Holy One of Israel, moreover, demands the complete allegiance of His people. Lack of faith in Him is sin (30¹) whether it take the form of idolatry (2^{8,18,20}¹⁰⁻¹¹ 30²²^{17,8,10ff}), or whether it be trusting in other strength

than that of Yahweh alone (10,20,30^{1-5,12-15}). "Woe unto them that go down to Egypt, for help, and rely on horses, and trust in chariots because they are many, and in horsemen because they are very strong, but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Yahweh!" (31¹) A particular form of faithlessness, condemned both because it is unethical and also because it is desertion from Yahweh is necromancy, witchcraft, soothsaying, or the consulting of "familiar spirits" (2^{6,8,19,28} 15,18). Another sphere upon which the definite denunciation of the Holy God falls, is the sphere of religious formalism.¹⁾

According to Isaiah those things a holy God will not tolerate, and those things against which He most violently reacts are injustice, dishonesty, corruption, oppression, of the poor and needy, drunkenness, vanity and pride, faithless deserting of Him for foreign alliances and outside help, necromancy, and cultic formalism. These things he makes incompatible with holiness. On the positive side, it is no mere sum of moral virtues, however, that God demands. Above all else He seeks the heart of His people.²⁾ He is most offended because "this people draw nigh unto me with their mouth and with their lips do honor me; but have removed their heart far from me." 29¹³ Like Hosea, Isaiah sees that unfaithfulness is the root of their sin. They do not know

2) Cf. König Das Buch Jesaja p. 46-7 God has a two-fold demand: heart loyalty 29¹³ and morality in conduct. ch/

/E) See below p. 112

Yahweh and injustice, oppression, empty religious formalism - these are the consequence.

Isaiah himself had seen and had come to know Yahweh. Particular stress may be attached to his inaugural vision because its genuineness is acknowledged by all critics. Its outstanding feature is the holiness of Yahweh which so impressed the prophet that it influenced his entire message. It may be assumed that it was a vision in the temple or at least that its setting was in the temple,¹⁾ the most ceremonially holy place and the center of the religious worship of the nation. There Isaiah saw God "high and lifted up." This exaltedness is particularly significant. Ever in Isaiah's mind, God is high and lifted up,- a symbol implying all that Isaiah meant by the divine in contrast to what is earthly or human. Isaiah is particularly impressed by the kingliness of Yahweh. He ~~sit~~^{sits} upon a~~n~~ towering throne and Yahweh, Isaiah, dares not gaze upon His face but his eyes fall instinctively to the skirts of His robes which fill the temple. Even the seraphs veil their faces and feet before His holiness. This is an element of unapproachableness, of separateness and exaltation above all that is human or mundane.

is That, this exalted holiness is essentially moral is made clear by v. 5 and what follows. Before it, Isaiah is overwhelmed with a sense of his own unworthiness, the unworthiness of sin: "for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips." That it

1) Practically all critics agree. See Gray for arguments against critics who view it as "the heavenly place" rather than the Jerusalem Temple.

was not ceremonial uncleanness which troubled Isaiah we may be sure from the fact of his presence in the temple (where no ritually unclean person would be allowed). This is made plain beyond doubt by v.7 where his lips being cleansed is made parallel to his iniquity being taken away and his sin being forgiven. Remembering that "in Hebrew idiom a man's words include his purposes on the one hand, his actions on the other, and thus impurity of lips means inconsistency of purpose and action with the standard of the divine holiness,"¹⁾ we see in this figure of speech the consciousness of Isaiah's moral unworthiness. As Jerusalem is said to be ruined and Judah to be fallen because their tongue and doings are against the Lord to provoke the eyes of His glory (3⁸) so here unclean lips are the cause of undoing. (Cf. Mal.2⁶ "unrighteousness found in his lips"; Zeph. 3⁹ "a pure lip" required for the worship of Yahweh, cf. also Ps.140⁹ Prov.8⁷ etc). Isaiah, then, says "Woe ^{is} ~~to~~ me!" because he feels that moral guilt attaches itself to him, and he knows instinctively that this sinfulness is incompatible with the holiness of God. Because he feels that the Holy Yahweh cannot tolerate the taint of iniquity the young prophet feels himself undone.

That Isaiah should have felt this in the temple is especially significant. It of all places was kept ceremonially clean; yet it is there that Isaiah becomes conscious of dwelling among a people of unclean lips. The ritual purity of the temple is as nothing before the holiness of

1) W. R. Smith Prophets, p.231

Hod. A cloud of smoke appears, probably symbolizing the reaction of Yahweh's holy nature against sin. Smoke or a cloud was a common symbol signifying the reaction of Yahweh against the world with which He came in contact (cf Ex 14¹⁹ 19¹⁸ 40^{34ff} I Kings 8^{9f} Ezek 10⁴), and as such it heightens the effect of His unapproachableness. But more than that, smoke came to symbolize Yahweh's anger, particularly His indignation against sin and wrongdoers¹⁾ (cf Isa 30²⁷ Deut 29¹⁹ Ps 74¹ 80⁵ II Sam 22⁹). It is particularly significant then, that when Yahweh appears in the temple His reaction against things is shown by the smoke which fills the house, even in this place which was kept in the highest state of ritual purity. It ~~is~~ is not ceremonial uncleanness against which ^{2/} Yahweh reacts. It is the guilt of "unclean lips" which rises up as smoke before the holy God. It is to be noted, moreover, that just as Yahweh reacts against the temple, so Isaiah a prophet, $\square' \Pi \beta \chi \quad \psi' \chi$, in particular relation to God, set apart to His service, feels unclean. There is a certain correspondence in the relation of the holy God to His temple and to His prophet. It is their moral uncleanness which render them unfit to bear the close presence of their God.

In vv. 6 and 7 Isaiah is still speaking in symbols. The ceremony of purification that takes place is an outward symbol representing an inner reality. It is not wise to

1) See Dillmann, on this verse in Isaiah.

press too far the various elements involved, e.g. the fact that the means of atonement came from off the altar. The whole ceremony is but a symbol, and we have here, perhaps, an epitome of Isaiah's thought concerning the cult. "It was and ever could be, but the symbol of an inner experience.

As such Isaiah had felt its helpfulness. "The sacrificial system had been a real factor in his religious life, and could not be thrust aside by him as useless in the life of

other men."¹⁾ It is to be noted, however, that this ceremony of expiation is conditioned by no offering or ritual prestation. The penitent acknowledgement of his guilt warrants the immediate response of divine favor, which comes as an act of "free grace." That a live coal of fire was the symbol used for the purification suggests, perhaps the same element we noted in 4^{3,4} where Yahweh's holiness became a blast of burning and extirpation purifying Zion's filth.

"Fire is both a symbol of holiness and an agent of purification" (Skinner)Cf Mal 3² "As earthly fire burns away external impurity so the heavenly fire burns away the defilement of sin, first from the lips, but through them from the whole man" (Dillmann). This vision bears out what Isaiah's other writings have indicated: holiness is for him essentially a moral and not a ceremonial concept. Yahweh is exalted in ethical purity in the presence of which nothing bearing the

1) Welch op.cit pp.147-8

taunt of moral sin can abide; (cf. 5¹⁶ "exalted in justice...
holy through righteousness.")

We have not, however, exhausted the meaning of holiness when we say that it is essentially moral. Isaiah was struck by the exaltation, the awe-inspiring power and majesty of God. Sublimity as well as morality is essential to the picture. That there was something more than moral purity involved in this vision of God is evident from the fact that not only did unclean Isaiah bow as unworthy of that Presence, but the seraphim also veil their faces and feet before the Divine. This can not be because they are morally unclean, but because they are creaturely before the supremely exalted majesty of the Holy One. If the root meaning of kodesh was that of separation, it came very appropriately to be used to express that separation of the exalted majesty of God from all that was creaturely or mundane, on the one hand; and that separation of the morally pure God from all that was unclean on the other.¹⁾ "God, so far as He is holy, is separated in everything which makes Him God from man in his fugitive and creaturely existence." This element recurs throughout Isaiah's teaching. eg. 2¹⁷ "Yahweh alone shall be exalted" and 33⁵ etc where God's supreme power over history and the world order is taken for granted. But in the mind

1) König sums up this double aspect of the holiness of God thus: "Die Heiligkeit Gottes ist seine Erhabenheit über alles Profane und insbesondere alles Unmoralische, weil die Stellung zur Sittlichkeit der oberste Gesichtspunkt bei der Würdigung eines persönlichen Wesens ist." etc. p.39-40 Das Buch Jesaja. Cf. also Dillmann p. 57 "Auf jesaianischer Erkenntnisstufe ist die Heiligkeit die Zusammenfassung ebenso der (metaphys.) Attribute seiner Eminenz, wie seines ethischen Wesens."

of Isaiah the outstanding element of God's holiness is his exaltation in moral purity. He stressed this side of his teaching because it was that most needed in his generation. There was no lack in the cultic respect paid to Yahweh; His supreme majesty was in general recognized and worshipped as such. But Isaiah saw that Yahweh's moral character with all that it involved for those who worshipped Him, was too ~~wa~~ little recognized by the people of his day. Holiness for him came to mean "that absolute purity of heart and life which glows like consuming fire, and in whose presence no uncleanness or corruption can abide."¹⁾ "Isaiah lifted the expression above popular usage by imparting into it high ethical meanings - the moral attributes of Yahweh Himself. Holy connotes God's supreme exaltation combined with perfectly righteous character, whose presence could not be surveyed or approached by sinful men. The fundamental conception, therefore which underlies this word, as Isaiah employs it, is righteousness. It is by righteousness Yahweh exalts and sanctifies Himself (5¹⁶)."²⁾

The finer elements of H are in agreement with most of the moral teaching of Isaiah. Demands for honesty, justice, regard for the oppressed are enunciated by the Code. Especially do they agree that Yahweh alone shall be worshipped. Exclusive devotion belongs to Him and the worship of foreign gods, heathen cultic practices, necromancy and idolatry are condemned in both alike.³⁾ H, however, bases Yahweh's unique

1) Alex Gordon Prophets of O.T. p.89

2) Whitehouse: Isaiah (Cent Bible) n. 55

3) Cf. e.g. Lev. 19³¹ 20⁶ and Isa 8¹⁹ 26⁶; or Lev 19⁴ 26¹ and Isa 2⁸, 18² 10¹⁰ 17⁸ etc

demand upon the fact that He is Israel's God; because he delivered them from Egypt and made them a nation therefore ^{Am/} they owe Him undivided allegiance and must obey His commands (Lev 19^{36b}, 37²² 32^f 25^{38,55} 26¹³ 45⁴⁵ etc). To Isaiah on the other hand, Yahweh is unique and the only God Israel may acknowledge, because He is, unlike any other god, the supporter and embodiment of all moral order, not merely because He is Israel's God and has redeemed it from Egypt, for Isaiah sees that that redemption had its moral purpose, and was to serve Yahweh's blessed ends. (Isaiah never once makes the deliverance from Egypt a ground for Yahweh's demands.)

Isaiah seems familiar with the ceremonial conceptions of the Code (whether he is familiar with H itself or an earlier draft of it is not the question here). He knows the meaning of ritual cleanness and uncleanness, ceremonial washing, etc. He uses such concepts himself, but only as figures of speech to express the moral demands so fundamental to his teaching. Uncleanness for him means only moral iniquity (6⁵ cf 4⁴) and when he says, "Wash you, make you clean" it means for him: "Put away the evil of your doings. Cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek justice, relieve the oppressed," etc. Isaiah took over these concepts as well as that of holiness, and thoroughly moralized them.

Though H ^Aould agree with Isaiah regarding moral de- ^{Am/} mands, the significant fact is that Isaiah limits the ^{Am/} holiness of Yahweh and His requirements to this moral sphere, ^{Am/}

while H does not. Ritual purity is a foremost concern of the lawgiver; moral purity is the only concern of Isaiah. The ceremonial system which found so large a place in ~~H~~ H is not only no requirement of Isaiah's God, but is definitely denounced by Him (¹⁰⁻¹⁷₂₉^{13f}).

This difference is due to their underlying conceptions of God. Isaiah conceives of Yahweh as so thoroughly moral that all His demands for men must be in themselves intrinsically right. H accepts any command; which, if coming from Yahweh, must be obeyed without question. It is the difference between a reasonable, moral Being who is to be obeyed because all His demands are right; and a Being who must be obeyed because He has the right to the allegiance of those He has separated unto Himself, and the might to enforce His commands. ~~Who insists that God's laws are wise and right. (28²⁹ 29²⁴)~~. It was enough for the Code to say that certain things should be done or prohibited because such was the command of Yahweh, but in Isaiah's God there is no trace of the arbitrary or ~~immoral~~, His commands are in themselves wise and right (28²⁹ 29²⁴ 31² 30¹⁸ etc). "Come now, and let us reason together" (¹⁸₁) was not a part of religion to H: but "that God reasons with man is the first article of religion to Isaiah. Revelation is not magical but rational and moral. Religion is reasonable intercourse between one intelligent Being and another."¹⁾

1) G.A. Smith Isaiah, 1927 p.6.

It was just this element which was most lacking in the Holiness Code. Though much of its legislation was inherently fine and even displayed a spirit of generous regard for others, a large part of it was purely arbitrary and non-moral. But because Isaiah made the bond between Israel and Yahweh a moral one, and because he saw that all God's demands must be intrinsically moral, those aspects of the Holiness Code which were lacking in moral perception or were purely arbitrary could have no place in his teaching.

Holding this view, it was not surprising that Isaiah came to grips with popular religion in its cultic aspects. In his definite opposition to what the Holiness Code stands for in this respect, we find the most patent illustration of that fundamental difference between them. To think that one can gain favor with the morally holy God by ceremonial observances is unreasonable to Isaiah, it is unthinking stupidity. "Israel doth not know; my people doth not consider" (1³) Like Hosea, Isaiah would say that if the people only knew Yahweh, His morally holy character and demands for righteousness, they could not be blinded by such regard for sacrifice.¹⁾ In the ideal future "men shall look unto their Maker, and their eyes shall have respect to the Holy One of Israel. And they shall not look to the altars." etc(17⁷⁻⁸).

It is difficult to determine from the scant evidence precisely to what extent Isaiah's condemnation of the cult

1) Cf. G.A. Smith op.cit. p.5-10

would go. That the evidence is scant (really only the one passage 1¹⁰⁻¹⁵ cf also 29¹³⁻¹⁴ 17⁷⁻⁸) is not surprising; for when we consider the fact that it was the priestly collectors who preserved this prophecy it is surprising that they did not excise this passage which so patently contradicted their own systems. How many similar passages may have been excised one cannot know. In regard to this passage some critics maintain that it implies an absolute and entire rejection of all sacrifices and cultic ceremonies.

1)
Others, however, read into it only a condemnation of making ritual a substitute for righteousness. Wade, for example, says "Attendance and offerings at the three agricultural festivals are prescribed in those parts of the Pentateuch (HE) which are believed to be earliest, and certainly pre-prophetic (Ex 23¹⁴⁻¹⁷ 34²²⁻³ cf I Sam 1²²) so that Isaiah's language must be rhetorical. What the question here really implies is that God does not want such worship as His worshippers actually render Him - formal service and practical apostasy (Cf I Sam 15²²)."²⁾ Sacrifice accompanied by the³⁾ perpetration of social wrongs, could only be an offence.

Is this the limit to what one with confidence can say of Isaiah's attitude toward the cult? From a consideration of chapter one alone, widely differing answers might be given. But in view of Isaiah's larger teaching concerning God, His holiness and His requirements of men, the thought behind

1) E.g. Powis Smith "Prophets and their Times" pp. 94-95;
 2) Wade, West. Com.
 3) Cf Dillmann Jesaja pp. 11 and 12.

this chapter becomes more certain. In view of the fact that nowhere among the long list of charges against his people (and Isaiah is not⁷ hesitant to denounce them for their shortcomings) does the prophet mention a cultic or ritual requirement, one can not only say that when he asks "Who hath required this at your hand?" (1¹²), it is not only "rhetorical language" but he really implies that such trampling of God's courts is no requirement of Yahweh.¹⁾ He not only "protests against the elaborate cultus of his day which the people were substituting for the practice of justice and righteousness,"²⁾ but he³⁾ opposes the ritual per se as a requirement of God. He was doing more than "but objecting to the exclusive place it occupied in the minds of the people."³⁾ It was not the abuse of the sacrificial system only, that Isaiah denounces, he would deny the efficacy of sacrifice altogether. It is no requirement of a morally righteous and holy God. Not only are the sacrifices of unrighteous men an insult and abomination to God; but they never have efficacy in procuring His favor or blessing.⁴⁾ Isaiah does not discuss this question abstractly or theorize about it; but it seems clear in the light of his entire teaching that this must be the interpretation of such passages as chap. 1¹⁰⁻¹⁷:

What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifice?
saith Yahweh.

I am sated with the burnt-offerings of rams and
the fat of fed beasts

And in the blood of bullocks and he-goats,
I delight not.

1) Cf König, Das Buch Jesaja p. 45

2) Powis Smith, op.cit. p. 94

3) Ibid. p. 95

4) Cf. König, Das Buch Jesaja pp. 45-6.

When ye come to see my face, who hath required
 this at your hand?
 Trample my courts no more.
 To bring gifts is vain;
 Smoke (of sacrifice) is abomination to me;
 New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies,
 I cannot endure.
 Fast and solemnity, new moons and appointed feasts,
 My soul hateth!
 They are a cumbrance, ~~new moons~~ unto me, I am
 weary of carrying
 When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide
 mine eyes from you.
 Yea, though ye multiply prayers I will not listen.
 Your hands are full of blood.
 Wash you; make you clean; put away the evil of
 your doings from before mine eyes.
 Cease to do evil; learn to do well.
 Seek justice; relieve the oppressed;
 Secure justice for the orphan; plead the widow's
 cause." 1)

In Isaiah's view "Whoever attempts with gifts to bribe the
 God of the universe and purchase his favor is not only a
 fool, forgetting that the whole world belongs to this God
 and that he needs nor desires aught; he offends and deforms
 the God of justice who represents the moral idea of the
 world, as if he were a potentate greedy of honor and enjoyments,
 and devoid of moral earnestness and righteousness. There is
 but one way to God's forgiving grace: the moral way, a sure
 way alone for upright and just hearts. To rend the hearts
 and not the garments, to be convinced of and confess personal
 guilt, to seek judgment, to relieve the oppressed and
 distressed, to abolish violence and treachery from national
 life - thus penitentially to leave the wrong way and

1) For parts of this translation Cf LXX and Gray's trans.

energetically search God's way - that is the new sacrifice which will bring propitiation; 'though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow.' With this conception the religion of primitive mankind is, in the main, eradicated, and that religion brought into being of which the worship of God in spirit and in truth' and 'reasonable service'¹⁾ form the center."

In this undeniable rejection of the efficacy of cultic worship, the question arises as to what extent Isaiah would reject all outward forms of worship and ritual. As in the case of Amos, though Isaiah would have swept away the cultic system as then practiced, he never faced the practical situation of what then to substitute for it in the way of worship. One can hardly conceive of Isaiah's advocating the abolition of the temple and its services. It was there he received the vision that changed his own life. Some critics would therefore hold that Isaiah could not denounce the sacrificial system per se; that he conceived of the means of atonement as coming from the altar, and that the "house was filled with smoke" from sacrifices. But the true import of the vision is just the fact that for once, - for the first time, perhaps, these things sank into the background as mere symbols, and Isaiah saw the Lord and experienced His cleansing grace. It was because of his penitent acknowledgement of guilt that he was cleansed. The

1) Schultz, A.J.T. 1900 p.277-8

spiritual insight of a sensitive soul in meditation had pierced beyond the forms of worship and had found God. From henceforth his relationship to God and not the forms of worship was the important factor in his life; and because he had seen God as morally holy, he knew that His primary demand was righteousness. As Gray points out,¹⁾ it is not necessary to conclude from this that Isaiah regarded sacrifice as positively offensive and intolerable to God under all conditions. The intercourse mediated by sacrificial communion, and the consecration of gifts rendered in true piety might go on,²⁾ as certainly Isaiah would not abolish devout praying which is fellowship with God, though he condemns utterly the mere outward saying of prayers (1¹⁵). But always such outward saying-of-pra^{forms of} ritual worship, the use of temple and altar, would be of necessity, but an outward symbol, for an inner, spiritual experience, just as they proved to be in Isaiah's great vision. And as symbols they might fall away if what they symbolized was otherwise preserved; indeed if the inner truth became forgotten because of exclusive regard for its symbols (as was the tendency in the popular religion of Isaiah's day) discarding the symbols might expedite a fresh realization of the truth. In a purified

1) I.e.c. p. xc

2) Cf. for instance the view of Dillmann "Der Prophet Jesaja" pp. 11 and 12 that while the inner attitude was essential the cult could be an expression of this devout attitude. "... den äussern Cult dagegen zwar nicht völlig entwertet, aber ihn nur als den Ausdruck wirklich gottesfürchtigen Sinnes gelten lässt."

community, however, it seems hardly likely that Isaiah would condemn all ritual worship, but the outward forms of even such a purified cult would be regarded by him as a "something Yahweh does not require, and that in no way palliates the sin of those who offer it"¹⁾

Like Hosea, Isaiah holds up to men a God of grace and favor to the fallen and undeserving, a God who will forgive, heal and restore. How far Isaiah goes with this aspect of his teaching it is difficult to determine, for the passages dealing with hope and restoration are largely questioned. At any rate the God of Isaiah had cleansed one man of unclean lips, and such gracious forgiveness the prophet could not have denied to others who with similar penitence and faith would come in contrition to the Holy God.²⁾

The basis of the relation between Yahweh and His people is in Isaiah's teaching, faith; i.e. a spiritual and moral quality which issues in a life after Yahweh's standards. H, on the other hand, had made the basis of this relation belonging to the nation, observing Yahweh's law, keeping ceremonially undefiled, etc., - not so essentially a moral matter. Whitehouse says that "faith in God is inculcated by Isaiah as it had never been taught previously.³⁾ It is a new note in prophecy;" but it must be remembered that implicit in the teaching of Amos and particularly of

1) Gray, *ibid.*

2) Cf. *Ibid.* p. XCff

3) Cent Bib. Isaiah p. 57, cf. also Alex Gordon: *Faith of Isaiah*, p. 63; and Kittel: *Great Men and Movements in Israel*, p. 268.

Hosea, faith or confidence in Yahweh's power and a trusting love for Him that issues in a life according to His will, is also an essential element in religion. Isaiah develops this conception and makes it "the fundamental duty of man towards God."¹⁾ Faith as Isaiah conceived it, was impossible until all that was arbitrary or unmoral was eradicated from the conception of God. The accidental heritage of being an Israelite or the observance of ritual regulations was/ ~~were~~ quite apart from the faith of Isaiah which was the outcome of a moral relation to God. His ~~retirement~~^{remnant} for example, who through faith in Yahweh would be saved, was not to include all Israelites, nor did it consist in an arbitrary or accidental residue; it was to be made up of those who by moral faith attached themselves to Yahweh and lived in accordance with His (morals) standards. On the one hand we have H's conception of a formal relation to Yahweh principally carried on through the ceremony of the cult; on the other hand, is Isaiah's conception of faith, a spiritual and moral quality which issues in a life according to Yahweh's will. Isaiah's faith becomes - what the religion of H could not become - a thing of the heart; not merely an outward honoring of God which is but a commandment of men (29¹³). Faith was for Isaiah "the one essential for true religion, and it was sufficient for continuance."²⁾

This staying principle of life, Isaiah carried into every realm, not only the religious. His faith in the

1) König, Das Buch Jesaja pp. 103-4

2) Welch, Rel. of Israel p. 189; cf König p. 103-4

moral God was the basis for his social teaching. His prophecies of doom and coming destruction grew out of his conviction that the holy God does see and will not tolerate such wrongs (e.g. ch.^s 2, 5, 10 etc.). It was in connection with the political policy of Judah that his doctrine of faith received its clearest enunciation. It meant for him "a ceasing from all natural confidence in one's own strength and power, a renunciation of all trust in human support and assistance,"¹⁾ and an entire reliance upon Yahweh in quietness and confidence, knowing that He will effect His moral purposes in spite of all earthly obstacles (Is^{27,32} 30¹⁵ 18⁴)^{n/} "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established" (7⁹) says Isaiah and he thus makes faith "the condition of salvation."

Isaiah may not have taught much that was altogether new, for most of his leading ideas find their germ in the teachings of his predecessors; but by his emphasis on things essential, and by his clearer enunciation of the fundamental principles of true religion, he cleared the way for straighter thinking, and enriched the heritage of religious truth.

1) Gehler O.T.Theol: Sec. 263

JEREMIAH

The starting point of Jeremiah's teaching is the same as that of Amos, Hosea, and the Code, namely the relation of Yahweh to Israel. Yahweh had chosen Israel and entered into covenant with them ($14^{22} 22^9 31^{32}$), He had brought them out of Egypt, and led them through the wilderness ($2^{26-7,17} 31^{32}$), He had continually educated them by the ministry of His prophets (7^{25} etc). Like Hosea, Jeremiah uses the figures of marriage and sonship to describe the closeness of Israel's relation to Yahweh and the duties implied in that relationship ($2^2 31^9 34,19$ ff etc.)

The great complaint of Jeremiah is that the people of Israel have broken the bonds (2^{20}) of this intimate relationship to their God. Instead of remaining faithful to Him, they have forsaken Yahweh. All Jeremiah's denunciations can be summed up in this charge: forsaking Yahweh. Again and again he returns to it. "They are gone far from me and have walked after vanity (2^5). "My people have changed their glory for that which profiteth not" (2^{11b}). "Thou hast forsaken Yahweh thy God when He led thee in the way" ($2^{17} 2^{19}$). "My people have forgotten me days without number" ($2^{32} 13^{25}$). "As a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me" (3^{20}). "Ye hearken not unto me" (16^{12})... "Refuse to hear my words (18^{10}). Summing it up,

f/

Jeremiah cries out in the name of Yahweh, "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, to hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that hold no water"(2¹³).

This forsaking of their God has shown itself in various specific wrongs which Jeremiah condemns. The source of all their woes is summed up thus:

"Is not this being done thee
For thy leaving of Me?"

In dealing with the resulting evils of this apostasy, Jeremiah lays particular stress upon (1) The false and idolatrous worship of the Baalim (2) False faith in cult, sacrifice, and temple. (3) Reliance upon military strength or the help of foreign powers. (4) Social injustice and unrighteousness. These are the outward manifestations of their forsaking of Yahweh. Jeremiah is not content to deal with these outer aspects of his people's sin. Like Hosea he sees that the most fundamental lack is heart-faithfulness. Even if these aspects of religious failing were corrected, that would not in itself fulfil the demands of a true relation to Yahweh. A "return with their whole heart" would still be necessary; and it is this essential which is the most fundamental need. "Circumcise yourselves to Yahweh, and take away the foreskins of your heart" (4⁴). In denouncing the evils of his day Jeremiah is saying little that is new. Among his predecessors the prophets, and even in the law codes of Deuteronomy and H

we find the condemnation of Baal worship, of unrighteousness and immorality, of reliance on the help of foreign powers, and of false faith in a debased cult. What we have noted concerning the attitude of Amos and Isaiah toward these things is equally true of Jeremiah whose greater strength and importance lie in the more positive content he gave to personal spiritual religion.

The denunciation of the idolatrous worship of Baal assumes particular prominence in Jeremiah's writings because of the fact that this heathenish worship had become particularly¹⁾ flagrant at the time of his prophethood. The references of Jeremiah himself are ample evidence of this religious apostasy. "Upon every high hill and under every green tree thou didst bow thyself and play the harlot" (2²⁰ cf 3^{2,6} 17²). They say to a stock, Thou art my father; and to a stone Thou hast brought me forth" (2²⁷); "The women make cakes to the queen of heaven and pour out drink offerings unto other gods" (7^{9f}). And worse than that, they even offer child sacrifice in the valley of Hinnom (19⁵⁻⁶ 7^{30f}). Jeremiah's protest against this evil is no single denunciation. He²⁾ returns to it again and again. His earliest oracles (ch. 2-3) are mainly a condemnation of this heathen worship and a call to repentance and return to Yahweh: The very last words we have from him, after forty years of prophethood, seem to be

1) See Skinner chap. IV. "Rel and Prophecy" and works on Rel. and Hist. of D.T. cited in Bibliography, 519-9-10; 30-48 914 101-6(?)

2) See especially 2 and 3 passim, 14²² 13²⁷ 16¹⁹⁻²⁰ 17¹⁻⁴ 18¹⁵ 22⁹ 23^{13,27} 43-44 passim.

those of ch. 43 and 44 where Jeremiah is still lifting his voice in protest against the false worship of heathen deities. We have noted a similar protest in the teaching of the other prophets, particularly of Hosea.¹⁾ In this respect the prophets and the Holiness Code are in substantial agreement; for the lawgiver, too, condemns idolatry and the worship of heathen gods (Lev. 18³⁻⁴ 19⁴ 20²³ 26¹) and in particular denounces the child sacrifice of Molech worship (Lev. 18, 20) and the apostasy of necromancy, etc. (Lev 19³¹ 20⁶⁻⁷ cf 27). But though in their negative protest against heathen worship they agree, in their positive conception of the content of religion ~~that~~ they are opposed. The Code holds up the Yahweh-cult as opposed to the worship of foreign Gods and proceeds to specify its regulations. Jeremiah, on the other hand, calls for repentance and a turning to Yahweh in personal, spiritual fellowship. No amount of ceremonial purification can satisfy: "Though thou wash thee with lye, and take thee much soap; yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord Yahweh." (22²).

Not only does Jeremiah protest against the heathenish worship of foreign gods which was practiced^s by his people, but he denounces the ritual of the Yahweh-cult itself and would abolish the whole sacrificial system. If there has been doubt regarding the extent, which preceding prophets criticized the sacrificial system there seems little room for disputing the

1) Above p. 77 seq and

attitude of Jeremiah. His words are clear; he would sweep it away entirely. It is not merely a non-essential, not merely wrong when practised by immoral people, but it is inherently wrong and was never commanded or accepted by Yahweh. "To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense, etc. ? Your burnt offerings are not acceptable nor your sacrifices pleasing to me"(6²⁰). "When they fast I will not hear their cry; and when they offer burnt-offering and meal-offering I will not accept them"(14¹²). "Shall vows and holy flesh take away thy wickedness or shalt thou escape by these?" (11¹⁵ LXX). And finally the locus classicus "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them: Harken unto my voice and I will be your God and ye shall be my people" (7^{21ff}). It is difficult to understand how in the face of statements as explicit as these, and such related passages as the address on the temple (ch.7 and 26), a commentator can say that Jeremiah only objected to the sacrificial system "because it was made a substitute for justice and true holiness...he was not necessarily wishing that the system should be abolished."¹⁾ The view of Pace seems more nearly true. "It is a rejection of sacrifice in se, not of sacrifices which though right and good in themselves, were made unacceptable by the unworthiness of the offerers."²⁾ As

1) L.E.Binns: "Jeremiah" in Westminster Com. p.LXII

2) Pace: Ideas of God in Israel.

Skinner puts it when discussing the great passage in 7^{21ff},
 "The error here rebuked is not simply the practical abuse
 of sacrificial ritual by men who sought thus to compound
 for their moral delinquencies; it is the notion that Yahweh
 had ever instituted sacrifice at all. The whole system,
 and all laws prescribing or regulating it are declared to
 be outside the revelation on which the national religion
 of Israel was based."¹⁾

It is a little difficult at this stage of our con-
 sideration of Jeremiah's teaching to understand the entire
 force of his condemnation of the cult. It will become clearer
 as we consider more fully his view of the positive content
~~me~~ of religion as personal and spiritual fellowship with
 God. When once this is understood, when the import of such
 a passage as his letter to the exiles in Babylon congratu-
 lating them on their opportunity of fellowship with God
 (29¹¹⁻¹⁴) is grasped; then it will be seen that Jeremiah's
 only consistent position was to repudiate the sacrificial
 system per se. Even without the passages cited above one
 would feel sure that in Jeremiah's own mind sacrifice would
 seem an offence to the true religion of the heart, and not
 a demand of the God who seeks personal fellowship with man.
 Thus Welch in speaking of Jeremiah's uncompromising attitude
 in this respect, says, "The prophet repudiated the sacrificial
 system of his nation in principle. He did not accuse the

1) Prophecy and Religion, p.182

people and the priesthood of having laid undue emphasis on the cult.....He denied the existence in Judah of any ceremonial laws which had the right to lay claim to the authority of Moses."¹⁾

This raises the extremely difficult question concerning Jeremiah's relation to, or attitude to, the existing Old Testament law codes, all of which assume that sacrifice was divinely appointed. An early draft of the Holiness Code may have been existent in his day. Welch maintains that he was acquainted with the Law of Deuteronomy.²⁾ It is clear that such an elaborate system as the cult of Jeremiah's day, must have been regulated by some such code, and all critics agree concerning the existence of such legislation in his day.³⁾ From his explicit statement ~~then~~⁴⁾ in 7^{22f} that Yahweh did not ordain the sacrificial system we can only conclude that he either rejected such codes as a whole, as ^{not} being divinely imposed upon Israel (though doubtless including much that was good); or else, which seems less likely, while accepting the moral and humanitarian sections of such legislation, he regarded the ceremonial regulations as falsifications by the scribes (of 8⁸). When we ponder the phrasing of 7²² "I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them---" it does seem as if Jeremiah is definitely refuting a specific view promulgated in his day.

1) Jeremiah p.143

2) "Jeremiah" p. 60,92,191 etc.passim; also cf "The Code of Deuteronomy".

3) At least the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law of Josiah's Reformation, whatever that may have been.

4) Amos 5²⁵ and Isaiah 1¹² (For the latter reference cf König Das Buch Jesaja p.45: The cult no requirement of Yahweh, but only human regulations.)

It is not our purpose here to determine why Jeremiah took the stand he did or how he justified it in the face of existing legislation. His attitude in itself is plain: he was fundamentally opposed to the cult. The importance of this phase of his teaching will come upon us in a later connection.

Of Jeremiah's protest against the nation's trust in foreign powers and its silly oscillation between Egypt and Assyria, little need here be said. In Hosea and Isaiah a similar protest has been noted. To trust in the strength of horses and armies is lack of faith in the power of Yahweh; to turn to foreign nations for aid is apostasy from the God of Israel. A typical illustration of Jeremiah's attitude is 17⁵⁻⁷ "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from Yahweh....Blessed is the man who trusteth in Yahweh and whose strength Yahweh is." In contrast to Isaiah, however, Jeremiah does not insist upon the needlessness of such aid because of a belief that Yahweh will defend Israel against the enemy, but rather because he is certain that do what they will, Yahweh will deliver them into the hands of the conquerors. He insists that the foe from the North will be their doom (ch.4,5,25¹⁻¹¹ etc). He writes to the exiles (ch.29) counselling submission to their foreign government. Whenever the revolutionary spirit broke out in Judah, Jeremiah opposed it. When about the middle of Zedekiah's reign emissaries

from several neighboring states came to Jerusalem to concert measures of revolt against Babylon, Jeremiah put forth all his energies to prevent the nation from being plunged into further disastrous war with Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 27); and he openly opposes the false prophet, Hananiah, who predicts the breaking of Babylon's yoke (ch 28). Later he warns Zedekiah against trusting in Pharaoh^{as} (ch. 37), nor was his confidence for a moment shaken by an apparent break up of the Chaldean armies at the approach of Pharaoh^{as} (37^{11 seq}). Voluntary submission to Babylon was the only way to mitigate the horrors and agonies of the final dissolution. When the officials of the nation proved unwilling to surrender, he even counselled private citizens to save their lives by deserting individually (21^{8,9} 38²).

In all this, the most important result for religion was not the protest against the faithlessness of trusting in human strength or of turning to foreign nations for aid. In this attitude toward his country's resistance to Babylon, Jeremiah is making religion independent of the nation's existence. He is saying in effect that though Israel as a nation be swept away, the true religion can still go on. Even more, he seems to make the continuance of true religion contingent upon just that, and maintains that Yahweh Himself is bringing about the nation's doom for this deliberate purpose. He is, as Skinner puts it, declaring "that religion is essentially independent of every

political bond, and exists in all its potency wherever devout Israelites turn with all their heart's to seek their covenant God."¹⁾ In thus freeing religion from the bounds of the nation Jeremiah is moving towards universalism in religion.

A fourth realm in which the people have forsaken their God is that of morality. Like Hosea, Jeremiah sees that unrighteousness, social injustice, and immorality are all essentially faithlessness to Yahweh. "Because they have perverted the way, they have forgotten Yahweh their God." If they really knew and were faithful to Yahweh, they could not thus sin. "Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery and swear falsely,---and then come and stand before me?" (7⁹⁻¹⁰). No less than Amos or Isaiah does this prophet demand righteousness in the name of his God. "Thus saith Yahweh: Execute ye justice and righteousness, and deliver ye him that is robbed out of the hand of the oppressor and do no wrong; do no violence to the sojourner, the fatherless, nor the widow; neither shed innocent blood." (22³)..."Thy father did justice and righteousness; he judged the cause of the poor and the needy. Was not this to know ~~him~~ me? saith Yahweh "(22^{15f})..."

Always Jeremiah insists that the doom he pronounces upon his nation is due to their sin, due to the fact that they have forsaken Yahweh their God. And since

1) Skinner: Prophecy and Rel. p. 295

he considers their moral wrongdoing a definite apostasy from the God of righteousness, the pronouncement of doom is often linked up with it. "If thou say in thine heart, wherefore are these things come upon me? for the greatness of thine iniquity are thy skirts uncovered and thy heels suffer violence" (13²² cf. 16¹⁰⁻¹³). "Lo, evil I bring to this people, the fruit of their own devices, since they have not heeded my word and my law have despised." (6¹⁹ cf 9¹⁹ and 5²⁹). Judah's afflictions, whether from nature or from foreign invaders, are due to her own wickedness (Cf. further 2¹⁹ 4¹⁸ ~~4~~ 7¹⁹). The God of Jeremiah, no less than of Isaiah and Amos, demands justice, righteousness and truth. (5^{1,26-8} 26¹³ etc). Injustice and oppression is condemned (2³⁴ 7^{6,10,28} 52^{2,3,13-5,17} 34 etc and references above); also covetousness (6¹³ 8¹⁰ 22¹⁷); untruthfulness (5¹⁻³ 6¹³ 8⁶ 9^{3,5} etc); sexual vice (2 and 3 passim, 5^{7ff} 9² 13²⁷ 23^{10,14} 29²³ etc); and murder (2³⁴ 7¹⁰ 22^{3,17}). Even the priests and prophets are denounced for these sins (23¹¹⁻¹⁶).

When compared to the similar denunciations of Amos and Isaiah, it is seen that while Jeremiah condemned the outward social wrongs as did they, he stresses even more than they, the sins of the individual: personal immorality, untruthfulness, the deceit of the heart, etc. He traces sin to its root principle with greater clearness of perception than even Hosea or Isaiah had done. Hosea

had suggested this conclusion when he perceived that all sin was due to unfaithfulness to Yahweh which in turn was caused by the lack of real knowledge of Him; and Isaiah *had* stressed the lack of faith in God. But Jeremiah goes farther than his predecessors. "He is led to trace sin to its seat in the perverted individual will."¹⁾ Knowledge of Yahweh and His will is essential as Hosea had pointed out: "Let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he hath understanding and knoweth me"(9²⁴). Yahweh's complaint is that "they know not me....they refuse to know me"(9^{3,6}). The birds of the heaven know their appointed seasons, but the people know not the will of their God (8⁷⁻⁹). Hosea never probed deeper than to consider this lack of knowledge, but Jeremiah traces it to the "stubbornness of the evil heart." (3¹⁷ 7²⁴ 9¹⁴ 11⁸ 13¹⁰ 16¹² 18²² 23¹⁷). It is a "rebellious heart" (5²³); the people "have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than a rock: they have refused to return" (5³ cf 2³⁰). "They hearkened not nor inclined their ear but walked in their own counsels and in the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward."(7²⁴ cf 7²⁶).

This need not imply that Jeremiah held the doctrine of original sin. The heart of man is not by nature sinful. The fact that Jeremiah calls for the people to repent and

1) Skinner p. 152

turn to Yahweh implies the renewing of relationship which was originally pure and true. To turn and live in right relationship to Him should be as natural and instinctive as for birds of passage to ~~re~~turn with the seasons (8⁷).

That Israel should forget Yahweh seemed to him as contrary to nature as for the flow ~~of~~from the meeting snows of Lebanon to cease (18¹⁴), as incredible as for a virgin to forget her ornaments or a bride her attire (2³²). But while man should thus naturally live in fellowship with God and according to His will Jeremiah sees that the heart of man is weak and easily led astray. Sinning becomes a habit and is deliberately persisted in (2²⁵5³¹14¹⁰18¹²); the heart becomes stubborn and indurate (11⁸9¹⁴). Then Jeremiah sees that "the heart is deceitful above all things; it is exceedingly corrupt; who can know it?" (17⁹). In such condition, the "stubbornness of the evil heart" makes futile any call to repentance. They will not heed, but refuse to receive correction (5³). "They have denied Yahweh and said, Not He!" (5^{12a}). So callous are they that they say no evil will befall them (5^{12b}). "To whom should I speak and testify in the hope that they might hear?" laments the prophet; "Lo, their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot give heed. The word of Yahweh is to them a scoff; they have no respect for it" (6¹⁰). To any who would warn them, they say, "We will not listen" (6¹⁷). Little wonder that the prophet came to consider such people hopeless,

seeing as little possibility for their repentance as for an Ethiopian to change his skin or a leopard his spots (13²³). No amount of discipline will bring them to their senses; a fiery furnace could not purify them, (6^{27f}). Because of their bent for sinning they recognize that of themselves they cannot return to Yahweh (2²⁵ 18¹²). "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (19²³). Only the creative hand of God can change them. It will be necessary for Him to give them another heart, and to put His law in their inward parts (24⁷ 31^{31ff}).

Thus Jeremiah traces, with a keenness of perception unequalled by any of his predecessors, the deepening callousness of his people, and sees that from a time of innocence they have reached a state of such obduracy that any attempt to recall them seems hopeless. Whether Jeremiah actually concluded that a change of heart was absolutely impossible seems doubtful. Such verses as 13²³, likening such a possibility to a leopard changing his spots, may have been but momentary exaggerations of a distraught prophet. Or in the light of Jeremiah's larger teaching, the verse could be interpreted: Neither can you also do good that are accustomed to do evil - unless there is a change of heart within you. Man of himself cannot mend his ways; let him turn unto the Lord and he will be renewed in heart and thus be enabled to live a new life. Jeremiah's profound sense of the ingrained quality of evil (2^{22f} 13²³ 17¹ etc.),

the deep saturation of sin and the enormity of the guilt of those who deliberately and stubbornly refused to heed the will of God (²¹²₉¹³-¹⁶₁₃¹⁰_f¹⁶¹¹-¹³ etc) was a much needed emphasis in a day when people thought that God could easily and would readily forgive sin (²³⁵ etc) and when they relied upon cultic ritual to atone for all their wrongdoings (¹⁴¹²₁₁¹⁵₇²¹ff). Jeremiah opposed the fallacy of this popular view, insisting that no easy washing could cleanse their sin (²²²) nor sacrifices absolve their guilt (⁶²⁰₁₄¹²₁₁¹⁵₇²¹ff). But this is only one side of his teaching. While on the one hand he gave needed emphasis to the fact that sin takes such hold on a life that it cannot easily be removed, on the other hand he called for repentance. And because he had shown the fallacy of any easy method of expiating sin, his call for repentance was deep and profound: a change of heart (⁴⁴), a return with their whole heart (²⁴⁷) not merely feignedly (³¹⁰₅²⁴). It meant acknowledgment of sin (³¹³₂₅ etc), the breaking up of fallow ground (⁴³f) and amendment of life (⁷³₄¹ etc). Jeremiah holds that "forgiveness is not easily granted by God nor cheaply gained by men.... Only repentance can avail, the repentance which is not the facile mood offered by many in atonement for their sins, but arduous, rigorous and deeply sincere in its anguish."¹⁾

1) G.A. Smith, Jeremiah, p.363

It is equally important to note what the prophet did not demand as requisite for reconciliation to God. Here lies the contrast to the ceremonial view of religion such as ~~the~~ H represents. Jeremiah makes no requirement save true repentance and renewed allegiance to Yahweh. Josiah's reform was initiated with a national celebration of the passover. Times of great penitence or turning to Yahweh were always accompanied by a lavish sacrifices and fasting, (e.g. at the dedication of the temple there was "sacrificing of sheep and oxen that could not be counted nor numbered for multitude" I Kings 8^{5,62f} and a fourteen day feast 8⁶⁵. Or cf. the similar occasion in the time of Ezra Chap. 6). But utterly different is the teaching of Jeremiah. He holds that no amount of fasting will help nor sacrifices affect their God. Yahweh says: "When they fast I will not hear their cry. When they offer burnt offering and meal-offering, I will not accept them" (14¹²). Yet even in view of the blackness of Israel's sin (2 and 3 passim etc), and though no amount of washing could make them clean (2²²), Jeremiah holds out the possibility of return to Yahweh on the one condition of repentance. "Return, O backsliding children, saith Yahweh, for I am an husband unto you." "Return and I will heal your back-slidings" (3^{14,22} cf 4¹ cf 31²⁰)¹⁾. If the people will acknowledge their

1) Regarding the authenticity of these verses see Welch: Jeremiah, ch.4

sin (³13,25 etc), turn to Yahweh with their whole heart (⁴2⁷) and amend their lives (⁴17³ etc) that is the only requisite for reconciliation to Him. An element of repentance was also present in the Code, but because H demanded so much else besides (cultic and non-moral), he obscured it, and because his conception of sin was not wholly moralized (including as we have seen, ¹⁾ things purely non-moral and functional), repentance could not be the moral quality Jeremiah made it. Realizing the deep hold of sin upon the heart, Jeremiah saw the depths to which repentance must go; and because he knew God's grace and love (³13,33 ²⁴7³²40 etc) as well as His thoroughly moral character (²²15-16 etc), this side of his teaching approached very nearly the fulness of religious truth. ²⁾

religion. In developing the positive content of religion, Jeremiah surpasses his predecessors. Not only would he sweep away the perverted ritual and denounce immorality and wrongdoing, but he lays more stress upon the spiritual fellowship with God and the life of obedience to Him which religion involves. Prayer and obedience constitute the essence of religion for him. ³⁾ Without ark or temple, priesthood or sacrifice, even with the fall of his nation and the cessation of its cult, prayer and obedience could go on, and religion need not perish, for Jeremiah had spiritualized

2) Cf Cornill op.cit. p. 98 f; Schmidt En Bi col 2370

12) Above p. 41 ff.

3) Cf. ~~W. A. R. G.~~ ^{W. A. R. G.} op. cit. p. 191, 223, 241, etc.

religion and made it "an intimate personal relationship between Yahweh and the individual soul, and heart obedience and devotion of the individual to his God."

cc. It is in the light of this positive teaching of the inwardness of religion that Jeremiah's rejection of the sacrificial system is to be understood. Amos and Isaiah lacked a clear description of what they would substitute for the outer forms of ritual worship. They had insisted on morality and right conduct, but they failed adequately to show how communion with God would be carried on if cultic ritual were abolished; communion with God which is the essential, and of which morality is but the outcome. Jeremiah goes farther than they. If anything is vital in him, it is, as Skinner says, "his experience of religion as immediate fellowship with God, and his conviction that the reality of it consists in a right inward disposition, in the instinctive response of the heart to the revelation of God."¹⁾ One could wish that Jeremiah had dealt more fully with a consideration of the 'how' and 'what' of this positive content of true religion. But though he never discussed it in the abstract, he did better: he lived it. He has shown by his life what he meant by fellowship with God, a contribution far greater than any number of sermons concerning the matter. Any detailed consideration of Jeremiah's "confessions", those passages in which he holds converse with

1) Skinner: Prophecy and Religion p. 325

his God, goes beyond the limits of our study. The passages are familiar enough, however, (1, 4^{10,19} 6¹¹ 11¹⁸ -12⁶, 15¹⁰ -16⁹, 17¹⁴⁻¹⁸, 18¹⁸⁻²³, 20⁷⁻¹⁸), and it is not their specific content so much as their general attitude and disposition which concerns us here. Jeremiah's own religion was the spiritual fellowship of prayer, the outpouring of his heart in the intimacy of personal communion with God. How far the older prophets were men of prayer is a question which we have slight means of answering. Skinner points out that "the theory of Oehler, Riehm, Giesebrecht and others, that the prophetic revelation always came in answer to prayer, is mainly a generalization from the case of Jeremiah which may ~~not~~ or may not be legitimate. We may suspect that in this respect, Jeremiah's experience was sui generis." ¹⁾

Former prophets had voiced prayers of intercession in behalf of their people (eg. Amos 7^{2,5}) and Jeremiah too had felt such anguish for them as once and again to intercede in their behalf (e.g. 18²⁰). But Jeremiah's conviction of the divine justice and the certainty of his nation's doom seemed to tell him that such prayer is in vain (7¹⁶ 11¹⁴ 14¹¹). So closely in tune with God's will was the prophet that he recognized His negative answer as well as the positive.

"To Jeremiah prayer is more than petition. It is intimate converse with God in which his whole inner life is laid bare,

1) Op.cit. p. 227

with its perplexities and struggles and temptations; and he unburdens himself of the distress which weighs down his spirit, in the sure confidence that he is heard and understood by the God to whom all things are naked and open."¹⁾

Jeremiah does not merely petition God in prayer; he questions, debates, reasons with Him (e.g. 15¹¹seq₁₇¹⁴seq₁₈¹⁸⁻²³₂₀⁷⁻¹²). He has been named by Wellhausen "the father of true prayer"; and despite the fact of a certain rebelliousness at times in his attitude towards Yahweh, he, more than any other Old Testament figure, penetrated farthest in this experience of true fellowship with God.

Jeremiah demanded the devotion of the whole heart to Yahweh, and insisted above all else that the inner disposition be right with God. This was no mere demand for others; it is something he also experienced himself. When his own inner disposition proved wrong, and in impatience he charged God with untrustworthiness (15¹⁰⁻¹⁸), he realized that he himself must ~~run~~ turn to God with his whole heart and stand forth in purity ~~unmixed~~ with what is vile"; he himself must "return" if he would be restored as God's mouthpiece. Religion for him consisted "in a right inward disposition, in the instinctive response of the heart to the revelation of God."²⁾

Apart from these "confessions" and the passages dealing with the cult, the most important passage relating to the spiritualization of religion is Jeremiah's letter

1) Op.cit. p.213-4

2) Quoted above p.138

to the captives (ch. 29).¹⁾ Apart from their own land, their temple, their priesthood and their sacrificial system, these exiles could not conceive of carrying on their religion. They felt themselves separated from their God. The prophet is ready to meet the crisis of their need with the fulness of spiritual religion. He advises them to settle down peacefully in their new land and there to seek Yahweh. Yahweh was not bound to the land of Israel, its temple, or its cult. Return from exile was in no way necessary for a devout practice of the national faith.

"For I am thinking about you, saith Yahweh,
Thoughts not of evil, but of peace
To give you a future and a hope.
When you pray to me I will hear;
When you seek me you shall find:
When you seek with all your heart.
I shall be found of you, saith Yahweh."

At all times they have access to God through prayer. He has regard for them, and His gracious purpose is to do them good. In Babylon as in Jerusalem they can continue to be His people, and He will continue to be their God. Characteristically the prophet adds his insistence that they must turn to Yahweh with their whole heart. Jeremiah "Thought of a relation between Yahweh and Israel which was not at the mercy of outward conditions or circumstances."²⁾

The temple might be destroyed, the kingdom pass out of existence, but true religion could go on. Their faith need not disappear when its shrine and its sacrificial system disappear, "for it needed no more than prayer and obedience,"³⁾

1) For critical discussion of later elements in this chapter See Welch op.cit. Chapt.8, Skinner, etc.

2) Welch, op.cit.p.190

3) Ibid. p. 191

wholehearted devotion. Skinner sums this up very finely when he says that writing to the exiles, "Jeremiah seeks to convey to them a conception of the true way to cultivate the presence of Yahweh. His premise is not that as individuals or as a community under an alien sky they may still retain some shreds of their religious heritage; but that in the privilege of prayer the whole reality of religion is theirs: that in the impending destruction of all the externals of their nationality - the temple, the sacrifices, the Holy City - God still lives, and having intercourse with Him they have all. Prayer is not merely petition for special material blessings, it is the search for God- an earnest and wholehearted search: 'When ye seek me, Me shall find me; when ye seek for Me with all your heart, I will reveal Myself to 'you'. Where God is thus revealed in experience, there all powers of religion are, and nothing essential can be added thereto."¹⁾

This spiritualization ^{of religion} is Jeremiah's greatest contribution. Had no one come forward at this crisis in Israel's history when nation and temple-service went out of existence, with just this message, one wonders what would have been the fate of true religion. But because Jeremiah met the situation, the religion of the future was saved. Some at least grasped his message and through prayer and obedience continued their relation to their God. It was this teaching of Jeremiah, as Welch points out,²⁾ which gave rise to the

1) Op.cit.p.290

2) Op.cit. p.248

synagogue. The Jews learned that without sacrifice they could find God and in prayer to Him continue their worship wheresoever they might be.

Because Jeremiah thus so thoroughly spiritualized religion he also became the father of religious individualism later developed by Ezekiel, as well as universalism in religion of which Deutero-Isaiah afterwards so beautifully sang. The germs of both are to be found in the religion of preceding prophets, but it was in the teaching of Jeremiah that they^{were} first clearly enunciated. By freeing Yahwism from necessary attachment to cult or temple or national home, he implicitly made it a universal as well as an individual religion, though he himself may not have gone as far as later prophets in tracing out these implications.

Marti says that "in Jeremiah's individualism we have reached the high-water mark in the evolution of the profound psychological and ethical conception of religion, not only of the prophets but of the Old Testament as a whole."¹⁾ In this as in many respects, however, Jeremiah is the heir of the prophetic teaching which preceded him, and he is apt to reap the glory due²⁾ the combined work of them all. One does well to remember this when it is said that "in the remarkable prophetic experience of Jeremiah religion appears to resolve itself into a personal relation of the individual soul to God."²⁾ This contribution of the

1) Op.cit. p. 174

2) H. D.B. vol.4, p. 276

prophet was not so much in the principles of religion which he laid down as in the experience of religion which he exemplified in his own life. "This individualism on his part merely involves that to him the relation to Yahweh is far too intimate to be adequately expressed under the forms of a national religion. God deals with souls which turn to Him."¹⁾ This Jeremiah knew because Yahweh had dealt with his own soul (e.g. chap 12¹ seq 15, 20 etc). To him personally, religion was essentially communion between the individual and its Maker. In times of discouragement, desolation and weakness he finds in this intimate personal fellowship with God his only solace. Here for the first time, as far as the records go at least, we find God dealing with the peculiar problems and needs of an individual soul. This personal experience of Jeremiah was the basis of his doctrine of individualism²⁾ and the greatest argument for it. As Skinner puts it: "It was because he himself had known the power of prayer, and the answer to prayer, and so discovered in himself the foundations of individual piety, that he was able to assure his brethren that God was as near to them in their exile as in Jerusalem, and that even loyal submission to a heathen power was consistent~~y~~ with the only homage which he demanded- the devotion of the heart which seeks its true good in Him."³⁾

1) Welch op.cit. p.35

32) op.cit. p. 295

23) It seems to me that J.M.P. Smith "The Prophet and His Problems" p.191f. fails to recognize the importance when he disclaims Jeremiah's teaching of individualism because 31²⁹ff 32¹⁹ff etc are regarded (whether rightly?) as coming from a later period. He has certainly not cited all the passages in support of Jeremiah's individualism.

When we turn from the experience to the teaching of the prophet we find several passages which explicitly state the doctrine of individualism and a number of others (e.g. 9²⁴17⁷⁻⁸) which imply it. Perhaps the most outstanding passage is 17¹⁰ "I, Yahweh, search the heart, and try the reins, to give to each man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings."¹⁾ Or again in 11²⁰ "Yahweh who triest the righteous, who seest the reins and the heart"²⁾ (cf also 20¹²). That this conviction on the part of the prophet was the result of his own experience, is shown by the verse: "O Yahweh, thou knowest me; thou seest me and triest my heart toward thee." (12³).³⁾

The verses 31²⁹⁻³⁰ are most probably not genuinely from Jeremiah. They are not, however, essential to him in order to preserve his reputation as an individualist. Indeed the writer of the passage seems to regard the proverb as justifiable and uncalled for in the bright future toward which he looks. But certainly Jeremiah would have seen as clearly as Ezekiel the inherent falsity of such a proverb at all times.

Jeremiah's individualism is brought out in his view of sin. In this he builds upon preceding prophetic teaching, and though he dwells upon the national sin in such acts as

-
- 1) There is little reason to doubt the genuineness of this passage. It is accepted by Skinner, Peake, Cornall and even Duhm. L/
 - 2) Though Stade and Schmidt reject this verse, it is accepted as genuine by Cornill, Streane, Peake, Skinner and by Duhm who says that here first in the Bible it is clearly set forth that Yahweh is cognisant of men's thoughts. gn/
 - 3) Most critics accept this verse, though it is rejected by Duhm and Schmidt. It expresses, at any rate, the genuine feeling of Jeremiah, if not actually his words on this occasion.

apostasy⁵ to the worship of heathen cults and alliances with foreign powers, he does not stop there. The prophets had all seen that injustice, oppression, and the violation of personal rights were sins, not national but social. Jeremiah presses this even farther and makes plain that sin is not merely national and social but personal. He traces its seat to the perverted individual will. Sin is sin of the heart and repentance must be change of heart.¹⁾ Yahweh who tries the reins and the heart will reward every man according to the way of his doings (17⁹⁻¹⁰). "Can any man hide him in secret and I not see him?" (9²⁴)²⁾ 23

The political policy of Jeremiah with its insistence on submission to Babylon is another aspect of his teaching which bears on individualism, for it shows that he conceived of religion as on a higher plane than that of national pride. We have already had occasion to consider his letter to the exiles and its implications for the spiritualization and individualization of religion. Others before Jeremiah - the earlier prophets - had made religion independent of the existing state; but Jeremiah was the first, as Skinner points out,³⁾ to give "explicit declaration that religion is essentially independent of every political bond, and exists in all its potency wherever devout Israelites turn with all their hearts to seek their covenant God."

1) Above p. 132-7

2) Though Duhm and Schmidt reject this verse its genuineness is accepted by most scholars: Gieseler, Cornill, Peake etc. r/

3) op.cit. p. 295

But what has been said about the individualism of Jeremiah does not mean that he gave up the national point of view. The starting point in his theology¹⁾ was Yahweh's relation to Israel and though in the course of his life's experience and teaching he shifts the emphasis from the nation to the individual, he never forgot the nation as such, and as long as he lived he addressed himself to the people as a collective whole. But in insisting that the essence of religion was a personal relationship to a personal God, he made it essentially an individual concern.

Nevertheless, Jeremiah never lost hope of the ultimate restoration of Israel. "Individualism is not the last word in religion, nor was it Jeremiah's last word." He combined this individualism with a hope of national salvation in his conception of "a new community of the people of God, based on direct personal knowledge of God such as he alone at this time possessed." Thus in his teaching of the new covenant (31³¹⁻⁴)²⁾ while he conserved the national principle in religion, he nevertheless placed the emphasis on individualism, laying on each man's conscience the duty which God required of him as a member of the covenant people. For him the nation is made up of individuals; individual men are not merely a part of the nation. This is a fundamental distinction and Jeremiah had grasped it. True religion must

1) As was pointed out above p. 121 ff.

2) Though Stade, Smend, Schmidt, Cheyne and Duhm reject this passage, its genuineness seems fairly well established by Cornill, Peake, Streane, Skinner, Welch and most critics since Cornill accept it as coming from Jeremiah.

always have a message for nations as well as for individuals. Jeremiah seems to have been the first to distinguish adequately between the two, and yet to include both in his teaching. Of these two aspects, however, Jeremiah's greater importance lies in his emphasis on the individual in his personal and spiritual fellowship with God. "It was a great step in the history of religion to turn from the formalism of an external worship and the legalism of a national covenant, and to find God in the heart of the individual, as One whose holy and searching presence strengthens every good purpose and pure aspiration that dwells there, and who sets secret sins in the light of His countenance. By the grace of God Jeremiah took that step and opened up a way of access to God which many devout souls, following in his footprints, found to be the way everlasting."¹⁾

Universalism is the converse of individualism,²⁾ as Marti puts it. He does not, however, agree with Cornill³⁾ that Jeremiah actually followed out the implications of his teaching and reached a truly universal view of religion. Critics are divided in regard to this question, but it matters little whether Jeremiah stated universalism as a doctrine if he embodied in his view of religion the principles that go to make it up. Peake sums up the question by saying that while formally religion remained national in doctrine, essentially the national restrictions were surmounted by Jeremiah

1) Skinner op.cit. p.227

2) Op.cit. pp.98-9

3) Op.cit. p. 175

"For religion as he conceived it was really independent of race and country....not confined to a single people; it was not a relationship between God and the Israelite, but between God and man. The universalism of Christianity was logically implicit in it."¹⁾ Jeremiah's view that religion is essentially a matter of the heart and does not need temple, cult, holy city or nation for its continuance bears out this conclusion. It²⁾ can be said with Welch that Jeremiah "thrust into the background everything in Yahwism which made it incapable of becoming the faith of all men.. He conceived it to be able to exist and to do its beneficent work wherever men prayed and offered the sacrifice of their obedience."²⁾ If religion is essentially, and only, a matter of the heart, which is Jeremiah's undoubted teaching, then it can recognize no limits of nationality or race.

As Jeremiah was engrossed in his concern for Israel, he does not often put his universalism into explicit statement; but it is shown by such passages as: "O Yahweh, unto thee shall the nations come from the ends of the earth and shall say, Our fathers have inherited naught but lies, even vanity and things wherein there is no profit. Shall a man make unto himself gods, which yet are no gods?"(18¹⁹⁻²⁰).³⁾ And in 12^{15,16} Jeremiah represents God as having compassion on the neighboring nations and saying that "if they will diligently learn the ways of my people to swear by my name ---then shall they be built up in the midst of my

1) Op.cit. p. 47

2) Op,cit. p. 192

3) Though Duhn and Findlay reject this passage, Gæsebrecht, m/
Cornill and Peake, etc. consider it genuine.

people."¹⁾ A less authenticated verse is 4^{2b2)} "The nations shall bless themselves in him (Yahweh) and in him shall they glory."

Just what the relation of these converted heathen to future Israel will be Jeremiah does not indicate. 12¹⁶ which says that they "shall be built up in the midst of my people" may imply that they would be incorporated in the new Israel. This is, however, a question with which Jeremiah did not deal. He had grasped as a fundamental truth of religion that it has a social aspect and cannot unfold its full powers except in a community. It would seem that to Jeremiah the only form of such a community he could conceive was that of nationality. The idea of a new community created by the spirit of religion itself and founded on a relation to God common to all its members, was perhaps hinted at in Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant. Jeremiah sees such a new spiritual fellowship in a regenerate and restored Israel (31³¹⁻⁴ and 24⁷). But in making the basis of this ideal solely the knowledge of God and intimate relationship to Him, he prepared the way for the larger conception of the Kingdom of God.

Cornill, accepting as genuine the verses in Jeremiah concerning the conversion of the heathen nations (16¹⁹⁻²⁰ and 12¹⁵⁻¹⁶), and realizing the implications of Jeremiah's

-
- 1) Again Peake, Cornill, Giesebrecht etc accept this passage as genuine despite Stade, Schmidt, Duhm.
 - 2) Accepted however by Peake, Giesebrecht, etc.

conception of religion in this direction, says without hesitating that the universality of religion is one of the "new grand apprehensions which Jeremiah has given to the world. Every man as such is born a child of God. He does not become so through the forms of any definite religion or outward organization, but he becomes such in his heart, through circumcision of the heart and of the ears. A pure heart and a pure mind are all that God requires of man, let his piety choose what form it will so long as it is genuine. Thus we have in Jeremiah the purest and highest consummation of the prophecy of Israel and of the religion of the Old Testament." ¹⁾

From this survey of the fundamental ideas of Jeremiah we are in a position to view his teaching in relation to the underlying principles of the Holiness Code. For Jeremiah the content of religion was summed up in its two aspects: 1) fellowship with God; and 2) obedience to His will. These necessary elements of all religion are also insisted upon by H, but what he means by them is very different. Both are agreed that obedience to God's will and a life according to His standards includes moral and humanitarian conduct. They alike insist upon honesty, justice, purity, regard for the oppressed, etc. But the legislators of H include much more; they assume that cultic regulations also form a part of that obedience which Yahweh demands. Their God commands

1) Op.cit. pp.98-99

sacrifice and ritual cleanness. Once it had been said, "Obedience is better than sacrifice," the Code now said: To sacrifice is part of your obedience, through carrying on ~~the~~ cult you are showing your obedience. Jeremiah (following the thought of his predecessors) holds a different conception of God, and he realizes ~~that~~ these arbitrary and non-moral regulations form no part of obedience to Him. Yahweh neither demands nor accepts them.

Similarly Jeremiah and the Code are at one in their demand ~~that~~ a relationship to Yahweh is the primary element of religion, but their conception of what constitutes this relation is very different. For Jeremiah, as we have seen, it consists in spiritual communion; it is essentially the relationship of prayer. In the Code, on the other hand, man's relationship to God is expressed through the cult. To the prophet the intimate converse of prayer is the only means of fellowship with Yahweh; the Code, while not excluding prayer, assumes that the sacrificial system is the God-given means of expressing one's devotion to, and fellowship with Yahweh.

A fundamental difference, ~~then~~, between this lawgiver and prophet is that while both insist upon a morally ordered life, the one gives added stress to ceremonial matters of a purely arbitrary and non-moral nature, regulations of cult and ritual purity. To the other religion is essentially an inward thing, a matter of the heart. This fundamental

difference accounts for their contrasted conceptions of sin and atonement. For Jeremiah sin becomes an inner thing of the heart, and for atonement he insists upon repentance, a change of heart, and a turning to Yahweh. For H sin is mainly a more outward thing, a breach of Yahweh's regulations ceremonial as well as moral, and he makes atonement primarily a matter of cultic ceremony. Jeremiah, on the other hand, spiritualized religion and insisted upon heart-devotion to Yahweh, making it independent of necessary attachment to temple, priesthood, or sacrifice, an attachment considered essential in the religion of the Code.

Both Jeremiah and H considered unfaithfulness to Yahweh or apostasy from Him as the greatest sin, the fact that the people were forsaking their God was the root of all evil. Their purpose was alike to secure Israel's faithfulness to its God. The Code attempted to insure this result by binding the people more severely to a hard and fast system of Yahweh-ritual from which they would not dare to deviate. By strict regard for the regulations of cult and priesthood and the rules of personal cleanness, it hoped to maintain the holiness of Israel and prevent apostasy from Yahweh its God. Jeremiah also sees the root sin in the forsaking of Yahweh, but instead of barricading the people round with cultic regulations, he strikes at the heart of the matter and calls men to a more personal and intimate fellowship with Him. Like Hosea he therefore pleads that they press on to know

Yahweh; for truly to know Him would mean to be faithful to Him, it would mean an understanding of His will and a life in accordance with it.

Jeremiah's complaint ~~with~~ the religion of his con- *against* temporaries is just this; they do not really know Yahweh and His will; they neglect, even "scorn" His true torah; therefore they insist upon things which should not be included in obedience to Him.

"They know not the way of Yahweh,

The will (torah) of their God." (5^{4b})

"It is because my people are stupid

And know not me;

They are sottish children

And have no understanding." (4²²)

"They have forsaken my law....

And have not listened to my voice,

Nor walked by it." (9¹³).

"The Word of Yahweh they scorn,

They find no pleasure in it." (6¹⁰).

"Unto my Word ~~they~~ have not hearkened,

My law they have despised!

What care I for frankincense from Sheba?

Or perfume from a distant land?

Your holocausts are not acceptable,

Your sacrifices delight not me." (6^{19b,20}).

"How can you say, 'We are wise,

And the Law of Yahweh is with us'?

When lo! the lying pen of the scribes

Has turned it to falsehood.

Put to shame are the wise,

Dismayed and taken!

They have rejected the Word of Yahweh

What wisdom, then, have they?"(8⁸⁻⁹)

These and other similar passages (e.g. 2⁸ 5³¹ 16¹¹), indicate that Jeremiah felt that his contemporaries did not live according to the real torah of Yahweh. Wrong demands were made in His name. Real religion consists in the true knowledge of Yahweh (9^{23f} 22¹⁶ 9^{3,6} 5^{4f}) and the possession of His law (direction or teaching) in the heart (24⁷ 31³³). "Let him that will glory, glory in this: in having discernment to know me, that I am Yahweh who works kindness, justice, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight." Jeremiah would have the people understand the ethical holiness of Yahweh, would have them know Him as father (31^{9,20}) and husband (3¹⁴), who is anxious to heal (3²²) and mould (18; them. Then would they be faithful to Him and rightly understand and obey His will; then such confusion between the moral and non-moral, as is represented in H, would be impossible; and men would find and practice (without reliance upon s/ the cult, a spiritual fellowship with God.

Because Jeremiah's emphasis had to be so largely destructive in clearing away the hindrances to true religion he exaggerated some aspects and neglected others. As Welch points out,¹⁾ his denunciation of the temple came perilously near making it a religious duty to do without such help to worship. Had he gathered round him a fellowship of kindred spirits all realizing the spiritual content of religion, he might have overcome this limitation and evolved some positive views of corporate worship. This opportunity and task, however, he did not face. But by being turned in upon himself, his greatest contribution was the deepening of religion on its subjective side. It was this contribution of Jeremiah and its continuation in like-minded psalmists which became the best part of the legacy which Judaism bequeathed to the Christian Church.²⁾

1) Op.cit. p. 239

2) Skinner op.cit. p.224

CONCLUSION

Though the prophets we have considered have emphasized different aspects, their general conception of religion has been substantially the same, and as a whole it represents a certain contrast to the conception of religion underlying the Code. The most fundamental difference, it has been seen, is that while to the prophets religion became thoroughly ethicized, in H it was only partially so; and by placing non-moral ritual on a par with ethical righteousness as commanded by Yahweh, the Code confused the conscience and led to an undue reliance upon cult, ~~to the neglect of inner virtue~~. As Montefiore says of the Hebrew legislation: the chief "drawback or misfortune of such a code was its equal accentuation of the ceremonial and the moral. More precisely, the evil lay in that mournful relic of outworn paganism - the conception of external holiness and pollution, of clean and unclean."¹⁾ While the Code ^{was sensible of} sensed no incompatibility in representing ceremonial regulations and ethical precepts as alike commands of Yahweh and a breach of either as a sin against Him, the prophets realized that the two were in no sense upon the same level. They insisted that only intrinsically immoral wrongdoing could offend the ethically holy God. Whether they considered sacrifice inherently

1) Op.cit p. 478

wrong, or whether they would have viewed it as an acceptable expression of homage or devotion to Yahweh, at any rate they saw that it was not on a par with Yahweh's ethical demands. In making this distinction clear and by relentlessly insisting upon it, they hit at one of the fundamental defects of the Holiness Code and made a lasting contribution to true religion.

The outstanding results of the Code's placing ceremony and morality on the same plane were (1) to confuse the conscience, especially making a wholly moral view of sin and repentance impossible, and (2) regard for the cult tended to become a substitute for moral righteousness.

Where God lays down rules which in themselves are arbitrary and unethical and sin consists in the failure to obey them, the conscience cannot consistently feel any moral guilt attached to sin,¹⁾ and the expiation of sin resulting from the breaking of such rules can only be of an arbitrary and unethical character. Thus while the Code did not exclude a moral element in expiation, it also included, and laid more stress upon, the non-moral, viewing the sacrificial system as having efficacy in gaining and regaining divine favor, and even referring to washing and ritual purification as methods for removing uncleanness. Such means of atonement were ethical only in that they were obedience to God-given rules. As the Code makes sin to be disobedience and

1. See further above p. 4/ff.

righteousness obedience, so it makes the way of atonement to be an obedience. The fault lay in that such obedience was too arbitrary, not too intrinsically moral, rules.

The weakness of the Code is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in its neglect to stress moral repentance. This it, however, made impossible because it failed adequately to distinguish between the moral and non-moral as demands of Yahweh. If a man becomes unfit for the presence of God through physical uncleanness, an uncleanness which he may have contracted without intending it, he cannot really repent, at least repentance can contain no such content as the prophets put into it. By cutting the connection between repentance and atonement, or at least by weakening it, the Code failed to grasp one of the essentials of true religion. In the prophets, on the other hand, sin was thoroughly ethicized and the character of God was seen to be essentially that of redeeming love. The simple prophetic teaching regarding atonement and reconciliation was summed up in the word: Repent; and such repentance included both a change of heart and amendment of life. And that was all; nothing further was demanded. Turn to Yahweh in faithfulness of heart, do good instead of evil and He will forgive your sin and "wipe out" your transgression, was their teaching. They did not seem to doubt that such turning and amendment were within the power of all, though Jeremiah comes to feel that through habitual sin and the hardening of the heart such callousness

and incapacity result, that the new heart must be the gift of God. "Cease to do evil, learn to do well, " is Isaiah's explanation of atonement; and Jeremiah adds to this the necessity of the grace of God working in men's hearts. In this respect the prophetic teaching approaches very nearly that of the Christian.

The failure of the Code to distinguish between the value of the ceremonial and the moral also led to an inevitable accentuation of the former at the expense of the latter. Because external cleanness is obviously much easier of attainment than cleanness of heart it would tend to absorb the attention. Simple folk would find in ceremonial regulations, something tangible and something within their power to perform; and placing their confidence in these outward and tangible things, they would inevitably grow to neglect the inner and more ethical aspects of religion. Concern for ritual cleanness would tend to obscure the necessity for cleanness of heart and mind.¹ This is exactly

1) Cf Marti, *op.cit.* pp.21819 "When external ordinances are set on the same level as ethical actions, the inevitable result is that ritual is magnified at the expense of morality; for firstly, the essential freedom of morality is affected by such minute regulations: it is disposed from the domain of liberty into that of compulsion; and secondly, if you can bring a sure proof of external religious duties, then less importance will easily come to be attached to social integrity."

what came to pass. Men performed the ceremonial regulations of their religion and left undone the weightier matters of justice, mercy and truth. The genius of the prophets was not only to see and denounce the resultant immorality, injustice, and social evils, but to trace to its source the cause of such neglect of Yahweh's moral demands. Distinguishing, therefore, between what is moral and necessary and what is unmoral and unnecessary, they denounce with relentless insistence the false reliance upon cultic observance and maintain that the sacrificial system is no demand of Yahweh.

In the prophetic attitude toward such ceremonialism as is represented in H, three possible attitudes or degrees of opposition towards ritual and the sacrificial system can be discovered. The first is a recognition of the fact that the cult is no substitute for righteousness, that sacrifice offered by unmoral people is an abomination and an insult to a holy God. This does not involve a rejection of the cult, but it is an insistence upon its worthlessness apart from the disposition of the worshipper. This is the attitude of the Rabbi, who though quite conscious that "the Most High is not pleased with the offerings of the wicked, or ready to forgive sin by the multitude of sacrifices,"¹⁾ was nevertheless unable to deny that the ceremonies were divinely ordained. Edg^hill considers the prophetic attitude toward the cult to have been of this character. While accepting sacrifice "as a natural part of their religion" they

1) Sirach 34¹⁹

criticized the false reliance of their contemporaries upon it.¹⁾
 This is not, however, true of the prophetic teaching as a whole. Hosea may have gone no farther than this stage of opposition toward the cult. He seems to regard the suspension of the cultus during the exile as equivalent to a "moratorium in religion."²⁾ He condemns sacrifice because by it Israel hopes to gain God's favor without moral obedience. He may not have had any objection to sacrifice and ritual in the abstract.³⁾

A second stage or degree of opposition to the cult is the view that not only is sacrifice of no avail as a substitute for righteousness, but that it can be dispensed with altogether, that a perfect religious life is possible without it. Even such opposition does not abolish sacrifice. It may be a means of expression for an inner relation to God; but it is never necessary as such. Robertson Smith feels this to have been the prophetic attitude, saying that the prophets' opposition to sacrifice does not prove that they have any objection to sacrifice and ritual in the abstract. But they deny that these things are of positive divine institution, or have any part in the scheme on which Yahweh's grace is administered in Israel. Yahweh, they say, has not enjoined sacrifice. This does not imply that He never accepted it, or that ritual service is absolutely wrong. But it is at best mere form which does not purchase

1) Evidential Value of Prophecy, pp.174-175

2) Skinner, op.cit. p. 294.

3) See further above page

any favor from Yahweh and might be given up without offence."¹⁾ This seems to have been the attitude of Amos, Isaiah and Micah, an attitude patently opposed to the Holiness Code. None of the prophets ever demanded a purified cult. Their religion could go on without it. Their God of ethical holiness had never enjoined it. Not only was its practice an abomination by the immoral, but the righteous~~n~~ could dispense with it altogether,- though the prophets may not have insisted upon their obligation to do so. The prophetic teaching goes at least this far. Jeremiah may have gone further.

A third degree of opposition to the cult is the view that it is inherently wrong. It is the rejection of the cult per se not merely of its abuses. According to this view, religion has no place whatever for sacrifice. Jeremiah at least approached this view. He seems to have believed that God would at no time accept, nor ever had accepted sacrifice. The sacrificial system was inherently wrong. Whether the prophetic teaching ever reached this degree of opposition to the cult, it was the implication of its teachings that led future generations to arrive at this conclusion.²⁾

This repudiation of the cultus was, as Marti points out,³⁾ no mere passionate outburst on the part of the prophets:

1) O.T. J.C. 1892 p. 295, cf. Moore: Ency. Bib. IV col422lf., Monti op.cit. p.131
 2) Cf Gray: Isaiah I.C.C. p.17
 3) Op cit. p.152

they saw the illusion, the false sense of security with ^{rit/} which the cultus lulled the multitude to sleep, as though communion with God were thereby restored and attained. They were bound therefore to recognize in it the chief hindrance and stumbling block to right fellowship with God. Moreover, it is no mere negative polemic. They all stress God's positive demands — righteousness, lovingkindness, faith, prayer and obedience, — all of which should spring from heart-devotion to Yahweh.

A real lack in the prophetic teaching, however, concerns the question of what positive thing they would have put in the place of the cult. As Welch points out, "The religious life needs more for its culture than repentance and prayer."¹⁾ What would have been the character of that pure worship of Yahweh desired by the prophets? Montefiore says that we are able to tell what it would not have been rather than what it would.²⁾ We find much polemic in the prophets against what was, but little explanation as to what ought to be. They are positive in giving content to what they conceived to be the essence of religion; but they are practically silent concerning the ways and means of corporate worship for those whose religion becomes of the character they demand. This lack is due to the fact that it was their primary business "to

1) Op.Cit. p. 239

2) Op.cit. pp127-31

attack the mistaken and immoral importance assigned by their contemporaries to outward religion, and to demonstrate its worthlessness as a substitute for that moral service of God which is manifested in civic rectitude and social well-doing.¹⁾ The prophets would agree with the Code in two negative characteristics of all worship: firstly it must be rendered to Yahweh alone and, secondly, be free from heathen practices. (Both the Code and the prophets contain much polemic against, the worship of heathen gods, and against ^{ascribing} assimilating into the Yahweh worship any heathenish practices.) On the positive side, the prophets would insist that everything in the religion and worship of Yahweh must be in accordance with His ethically holy character, and in laying down this principle which should apply to the worship of all time, they made a greater contribution than to have worked out a specific system for their day.

The fundamentals of prophetic religion as contrasted to those of H were largely the outgrowth of their truer conception of God. This was particularly true of the conception of holiness which figured so prominently in the religion of that day. As Skinner so finely points out: "The question as to the contents of the idea of divine holiness resolves itself into the larger question of the conception of Godhead by which religious practices and devotion were ruled; and the development of the idea in the Old Testament

1) Ibid. p. 130-1

may be expected to proceed step by step with the progressive revelation of the character and nature of Yahweh." ¹⁾ When Yahweh was thought of as a Being of physical majesty who delighted in the savor of burnt offerings and incense, then His presence would have been considered unapproachable save under the strictest regulations of ceremonial cleanliness, and His favor sought by means of sacrifice and cultic observance. This was to a large extent the view of the Holiness Code. But the God whom the prophets held up before the people was of a very different nature, a spiritual and moral personality whose ethical character was reflected in the demands of conscience, and who was inexorable in His requirement of a righteousness corresponding to His own. The sphere of righteousness is not ritual and ceremonial but social and political and it springs from a heart which knows God and is devoted to Him. In the light of this completely ethical conception of God the idea of holiness became charged with ethical meaning, both in its application ^{to God, and as a requirement} He makes upon men.

The ethical conception of purity does not exhaust the idea of holiness. Yahweh was always regarded as a Being of awful and unapproachable majesty; but as the Holy One, He grew to be feared not simply because He was all-powerful, but because of His opposition to all that was impure and

1) HDB II, p.397

sinful¹⁾ As George Adam Smith points out, holiness came to cover "not only that moral purity and intolerance of sin but those metaphysical conceptions as well which we gather up under the name 'supernatural', and so, finally, by lifting the divine nature away from the change and vanity of this world, and emphasizing God's independence of all besides Himself, it has become the fittest expression we have for Him as the Infinite and Self-existent."²⁾

The recognition of Recognizing the superiority of prophetic religion need not obscure the contributions and true worth of the Holiness Code. In the course of religious development it served to bridge the gap between the primitive religion of tabu and the higher ethical Yahwism. Its failure was not to distinguish between the two. Nevertheless, it contains much that is intrinsically fine, and Lev. 19 has been called the highest representation of Old Testament ethics. In maintaining Yahweh's right to the exclusive devotion of Israel, it also made for monotheism. The Code, moreover, insisted that all man's conduct, whether religious or moral was to be governed by the will of God. It included every species of ordinance under the general sanction, "For I am Yahweh your God", and every rule of conduct whether ethical or religious became authoritative as a demand of Yahweh. It was this aspect of the Code which unconsciously provided

1)-Gf:-Skinner;-HBB-II;-p:-

1) Cf. Skinner HDB II, p. 397

2) Isaiah, 1927, p. 64

for its own overthrow. Men were taught to find the sanction for conduct (both religious and moral, in their God; and as they came more clearly to understand His character and His demands, it meant that the intrinsically unmoral aspects of such a code fell inevitably into the background and were finally definitely to be opposed and discarded. This, we have seen, was the work of the prophets. But our study has shown us something of the immensity and of the tremendous difficulty of this task which the prophets faced. But to look at Jeremiah is to realize how arduous and with what travail of suffering, was this growth of true religion accomplished.